

Early Debates on the Integrity of the Qur'ān: A Brief Survey

Author(s): Hossein Modarressi

Source: *Studia Islamica*, No. 77 (1993), pp. 5-39

Published by: [Maisonneuve & Larose](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1595789>

Accessed: 31/12/2014 06:05

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Maisonneuve & Larose is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Studia Islamica*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

EARLY DEBATES ON THE INTEGRITY OF THE QUR'ĀN

A BRIEF SURVEY *

This short article attempts to shed some light on the origins of the Sunnite-Shī'ite controversies on the integrity of the text of the Qur'ān. The development of these debates in the first Islamic centuries represents an interesting example of how ideas evolved in the early period through sectarian disputes, as well as contact and communication between various Muslim sects and schools of thought. Despite severe mistrust, various factors existed to facilitate the give and take among different sects. Most prominent was a group of *ḥadīth* transmitters who frequented different sectarian camps and, thereby, introduced much of each sect's literature to the others. Often confusion on the part of these "bipolar" narrators of *ḥadīth* helped "naturalize" segments of one sect's literature into that of another sect.

This was particularly true in Shī'ism, many of its transmitters heard *ḥadīth* from both Shī'ite and Sunnite sources, and later misattributed much of what they had heard.⁽¹⁾ The early Shī'ite

* I would like to thank Professors Michael Cook, Avrom Udovitch and Jeanette Wakin for their valuable comments on an earlier draft of this article.

(1) See, for instance, Kashshī, *Ma'rifat al-nāqilīn = Kitāb al-Rijāl*, abridged by Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī as *Ikhliyār Ma'rifat al-rijāl*, ed. Ḥ. Muṣṭafawī (Mashhad, 1970), pp. 590-91, where Shādhān b. Khalīl al-Naysābūrī asks the celebrated Shī'ite *ḥadīth* transmitter Abū Aḥmad Muḥammad b. Abī 'Umayr al-Azdī (d. 217/832), who heard *ḥadīth* from both Sunnite and Shī'ite sources, why he never quoted any Sunnite *ḥadīth* to his students and in his works. Ibn Abī 'Umayr answered that he deliberately avoided that since he "found many of the Shī'ites studied both Shī'ites and Sunnite 'traditions' but later confused and ascribed Sunnite material to Shī'ites sources and vice versa."

mutakallimūn also quoted statements from the Sunnite sources in their polemics against the Sunnites as *argumentum ad hominem*. But from the mid 3rd/9th century onward, it was common for some Shī'ite authors and traditionists to attribute a Shī'ite origin to this material, since it was thought that whatever the companions of the Imāms and early Shī'ite *mutakallimūn* said or wrote, even what they used in their polemics, necessarily represented the views and statements of the Imāms.⁽²⁾ This assumption led to the introduction of much alien material into Shī'ite thought.

Many of these early interchanges were forgotten over time. Hence it was not known that many of the ideas that were later labeled as Sunnite, Shī'ite, or the like were originally held by a different group or, at least in the early period before the sects took on their final shape, were shared by various mainstream elements of Islamic society. The question of the integrity of the 'Uthmānic text of the Qur'ān and the controversies surrounding it are a prime example of that phenomenon. The central issue in these debates was whether the 'Uthmānic text comprehended the entire body of material that was revealed to the Prophet, or whether there had been further material that was missing from the 'Uthmānic text. In the following pages, we shall examine the Sunnite-Shī'ite interchanges on this question.

*
**

The evidence in the text of the Qur'ān itself as well as in *ḥadīth* indicates that the Prophet compiled a written scripture for Islam during his own life-time, most likely in his first years in Medina.⁽³⁾ He reportedly continued until the end of his life to

(2) See Kulaynī, *al-Kāfī*, ed. 'A. A. Ghaffārī (Tehran, 1377-79/1957-59), I, p. 99, footnote 1. See also Etan Kohlberg, "Imām and Community in the Pre-Ghayba Period", in Said Amir Arjomand (ed.) *Authority and Political Culture in Shī'ism* (New York, 1988), p. 38. Compare this with the attitude of some Sunnite scholars who maintain that the statements of the companions of the Prophet on religious matters should normally be taken as reflecting the statements of the Prophet, since it was thought unlikely that the Companions would decide on matters of *sharī'a* independently (see Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ, *Mabāḥith fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān* [Beirut, 1977], p. 134 and the sources mentioned therein).

(3) See anonymous, *al-Mabānī fī naẓm al-ma'ānī*, ed. A. Jeffery (in the collection of *Muqaddamatān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān* [Cairo, 1954], pp. 26-38; Zarkashī, *al-Burhān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*, ed. M. A. Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1957), I, pp. 235, 237-38, 256, 258;

personally instruct the scribes where to insert new passages of the revelation in the scripture.⁽⁴⁾ There are also indications that parts of earlier revelations were not included in the scripture. One verse in the Qur'ān acknowledges the absence of a part of revelation which was abrogated or "caused to be forgotten,"⁽⁵⁾ another spoke of verses that God substituted for others.⁽⁶⁾ Early Muslims reportedly used to recall verses of the revelation they did not find in the new scripture. They were, however, aware that those passages were deliberately excluded by the Prophet, since the Muslims frequently referred to them as what was "abrogated" (*nusikha*), "lifted" (*ruft'a*), "caused to be forgotten" (*unsiya*), or "dropped" (*usqiṭa*).⁽⁷⁾ The concept of abrogation of the revelation (*naskh al-Qur'ān*) apparently referred originally to those parts that were not included by the Prophet in the scripture.⁽⁸⁾ Later, however, the concept was developed in the Sunnite tradition to include several hypothetical categories, most of them with examples preserved in the present text of the Qur'ān. With a

Suyūṭī, *al-Itqān fī 'ulūm al-Qur'ān*, ed. M. A. Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1967), I, pp. 212-13, 216; *Bell's Introduction to the Qur'ān*, revised by W. Montgomery Watt (Edinburgh, 1970), p. 143; A.T. Welch, *al-Qur'ān* (in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed. IV, pp. 400-29), p. 403 and the sources quoted therein.

(4) Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *al-Musnad* (Cairo, 1313/1895-6), I, p. 57; Tirmidhī, *Sunan* (Medina, 1964), IV, pp. 336-37; al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī, *al-Mustadrak* (Hyderabad, 1340/1922), II, p. 229.

(5) Qur'ān, II: 106: *Mā nansakh min āyatin aw nunsihā na'li bi-khairin minhā aw mūthlihā* = "For whatever verse We abrogate or cause to be forgotten We bring a better or a similar one."

(6) Qur'ān, XVI: 101: *Wa idhā baddalnā āyatan makāna āya* ... = "When We substitute one verse for another."

(7) See, for instance, Abu 'Ubayd, *al-Nāsikh wa'l-mansūkh fī 'l-Qur'ān al-karīm*, ed. John Burton (Cambridge, 1987), p. 6; Muḥāsibī, *Fahm al-Qur'ān wa ma'ānīh*, ed. H. Quwwatī (in the collection of *al-'Aql wa fahm al-Qur'ān* [n.p., 1971], pp. 261-502), pp. 399 (quoting Anas b. Mālik), 400 and 408 (quoting 'Amr b. Dīnār), 403 (quoting 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Awf), 405 (quoting Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī), 406; Ṭabarī, *Jāmi' al-bayān*, ed. M. M. Shākir (Cairo, 1955), III, pp. 472-74, 476, 479-80; Ibn Salāma, *al-Nāsikh wa 'l-mansūkh* (Beirut, 1984), p. 21 (quoting 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd); Suyūṭī, *al-Durr al-manthūr* (Cairo, 1314/1897), V, p. 179 (quoting Ubayy b. Ka'b); Idem, *Itqān*, III, pp. 83-84 (quoting 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Awf and 'Abd Allāh b. 'Umar).

(8) See Abu 'Ubayd, p. 6; Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, ed. A. M. Qal'ajī (Beirut, 1985), VII, p. 154 (where it is argued that the Prophet did not put the Qur'ān together since there was always the expectation that some verses might be abrogated and that some later modification was thus inevitable in any collection of the Qur'ān put together during his lifetime. Underlying this argument is the assumption that the abrogated verses had to be physically removed from the Scripture). See also Zarkashī, II, p. 30 (the first interpretation of the concept of *naskh*).

single possible exception,⁽⁹⁾ however, it is highly doubtful that the Qur'ān includes any abrogated verse.

The Sunnite account of the collection of the Qur'ān is completely different from the above. It contends that the Qur'ān was not compiled in a single volume until after the Prophet died in the year 11/632.⁽¹⁰⁾ The "recorders of the revelation" (*kuttāb al-wahy*) used to jot down the verses immediately after the Prophet received and recited them. Others among the faithful memorized portions of the revelation or occasionally recorded them on whatever primitive writing material was available. According to the supporters of this account, the fact that the Qur'ān was not compiled as a book until the death of the Prophet is perfectly logical. As long as he was alive there was always the expectation of further revelation as well as occasional abrogations. Any formal collection of the material already revealed could not properly be considered a complete text.⁽¹¹⁾ Many people had memorized large parts of the revelation, which they repeated in their prayers and recited to others. As long as the Prophet was living among the faithful as the sole authority there was no need for a formal reference book of religion or a code of law. All of these considerations would change after his death and the new circumstances would necessitate the collection of the Qur'ān. The story as reported by the Sunnite sources is as follows:

Two years after the Prophet died, the Muslims were engaged in a bloody battle with a rival community at Yamāma in the deserts of Arabia. Many of the memorizers (*qurrā'*) of the Qur'ān lost their lives at this time.⁽¹²⁾ Fearing that a great portion of the Qur'ān

(9) See Abu 'l-Qāsim al-Khu'ī, *al-Bayān* (Najaf, 1966), pp. 305-403.

(10) See Ibn Sa'd, *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-kabīr*, ed. E. Sachau et al. (Leiden, 1904-15), III, pp. 211, 281; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif*, ed. A. Jeffery (Leiden, 1937), p. 10; Ibn Bābawayh, *Kamāl al-dīn*, ed., 'A. A. Ghaffārī (Tehran, 1390/1970), pp. 31-32; Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il*, VII, pp. 147-8, 152; Zarkashī, I, p. 262; Ibn Abi 'l-Hadīd, *Sharḥ Nahj al-balāgha*, ed. M. A. Ibrāhīm (Cairo, 1959-64), I, p. 27; Ibn Juzayy, *al-Tashīl li-'ulūm al-tanzīl* (Cairo, 1355/1936), I, p. 4; *Itqān*, I, p. 202. See also Ibrāhīm al-Ḥarīb, *Gharīb al-ḥadīth*, ed. S. I. 'Ayid (Mecca, 1985), I, p. 270.

(11) Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il*, VII, p. 154; Zarkashī, I, pp. 235, 262; *Itqān*, I, p. 202; Aḥmad al-Narāqī, *Manāhij al-aḥkām* (Tehran, n.d.), p. 152, l. 33.

(12) According to Ya'qūbī, *Kitāb al-Ta'rīkh* (Beirut, 1960), II, p. 15, "most" of the "bearers" (*ḥamala*) of the Qur'ān were killed during that battle. All together, some 360 persons among the distinguished companions of the Prophet lost their lives on that occasion (Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh*, ed. M. A. Ibrāhīm [Cairo, 1960], III, p. 296). Larger figures, up to 500 (Ibn al-Jazarī, *al-Nashr* [Cairo, n.d.] p. 7; Ibn Kathīr, *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān* [Beirut, 1966], VII, p. 439), 700 (Qurtubī, *al-Jāmi' li-aḥkām al-*

would be lost should a similar situation arise and more memorizers of the Qur'ān die, Abū Bakr, the first successor to the Prophet, ordered that the Qur'ān be collected. To this end, the Prophet's companions and the memorizers of the Qur'ān were asked to come forward with any parts of the revelation they had memorized or written down in any form. Abū Bakr ordered 'Umar, his successor to be, and Zayd b. Thābit, a young recorder of revelation during the Prophet's lifetime, to sit at the entrance to the mosque of Medina and record any verse or part of the revelation that at least two witnesses testified they had heard from the Prophet. In one particular case, though, the testimony of a single witness was accepted.⁽¹³⁾ All of the material gathered in this manner was recorded on sheets of paper,⁽¹⁴⁾ or parchment, but was not yet compiled as a volume. Furthermore, these materials were not made available to the Muslim community, which continued to possess the Qur'ān only in its primitive scattered form. The sheets remained in the keeping of Abū Bakr and 'Umar, and after 'Umar's death they passed to his daughter Ḥafṣa. 'Uthmān took the sheets from Ḥafṣa during his caliphate and had them put together in the form of a volume. He had several copies sent to different parts of the Muslim world and he then ordered that any other collection or portion of the Qur'ān found anywhere else be burned.⁽¹⁵⁾

Qur'ān [Cairo, 1967], I, p. 50) and 1200 ('Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī, *Uṣūl al-dīn* [Beirut, 1981], p. 283) are also given. The last figure is, however, the number of all Muslims who were killed in that battle, Companions and others (see Ṭabarī, III, p. 300).

(13) The case in question was the last two verses of *sūra* 9 in the present Qur'ān, which was added on the authority of Khuzayma b. Thābit al-Anṣārī (or Abū khuzayma according to some reports). See Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ* (Leiden, 1862-1908), III, pp. 392-393, IV, pp. 398-99; Tirmidhī, IV, pp. 346-47; Abū Bakr al-Marwazī, *Musnad Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq*, ed. Sh. Arna'ut (Damascus, 1970), pp. 97-99, 102-4; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, pp. 6-7, 9, 20; Ibn al-Nadīm, p. 27; al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Muḍīḥ awhām al-jam' wa 'l-tafrīg* (Hyderabad, 1959), I, p. 276; Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il*, VII, pp. 149-50; Zarkashī, I, p. 238. For variations of this report see al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, *Talkhīṣ al-Mutashābih fi 'l-rasm*, ed. S. Shihābī (Damascus, 1985), I, p. 403 and Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 9 in both of which the witness is Ubayy b. Ka'b, rather than Khuzayma or Abū Khuzayma.

(14) Ya'qūbī, II, p. 135; *Itqān*, I, pp. 185, 207, 208.

(15) Bukhārī, III, pp. 393-94; Tirmidhī, IV, pp. 347-8; Abū Bakr al-Marwazī, pp. 99-101; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, pp. 18-21; Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il*, VII, pp. 150-151; Abū Hilāl al-'Askarī, *Kitāb al-Awā'il*, ed. W. Qaṣṣāb and M. Miṣrī (Riyadh, 1980), I, p. 218.

This whole story about the collection of the Qur'ān was accepted by the Sunnite scholars as trustworthy and served, as we shall see below, as the basis for the idea that later emerged of the incompleteness of the text of the Qur'ān.

*
**

Sunnite literature contains many reports that suggest that some of the revelation had already been lost before the collection of the Qur'ān initiated by Abū Bakr. It is reported, for example, that 'Umar was once looking for the text of a specific verse of the Qur'ān he vaguely remembered. To his deep sorrow, he discovered that the only person who had any record of that verse had been killed in the battle of Yamāma and that the verse was consequently lost.⁽¹⁶⁾ 'Umar allegedly had a recollection of a Qur'ānic verse on stoning as a punishment for adultery.⁽¹⁷⁾ But he could not convince his colleagues to insert it in the Qur'ān because nobody else came forward to support him,⁽¹⁸⁾ and the requirement that there be two witnesses for any text to be accepted as a part of the Qur'ān was therefore not met. Later, however, some other Companions recalled that same verse,⁽¹⁹⁾ including 'Ā'isha, the Prophet's youngest wife. She is alleged to have said that a sheet on which two verses, including that on stoning, were recorded was under her bedding and that after the Prophet died, a domestic animal⁽²⁰⁾ got into the room and gobbled up the sheet while the

(16) Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 10; *Itqān*, I, p. 204.

(17) Mālik b. Anas, *al-Muwatṭa'*, ed. M. F. 'Abd al-Bāqī (Cairo, 1951), II, p. 824; Aḥmad, I, pp. 47, 55; Muḥāsibī, pp. 398, 455; Ibn Abī Shayba, *al-Muṣannaf* (Beirut, 1989), VII, p. 431; Bukhārī, IV, p. 305; Muslim, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, ed. M. F. 'Abd al-Bāqī, II, p. 1317; Ibn Māja, *Sunan*, ed. M. F. 'Abd al-Bāqī (Cairo, 1954), II, p. 853; Tirmidhī, II, pp. 442-3; Abū Dāwūd, *Sunan*, ed. M. M. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd (Cairo, 1935), IV, p. 145; Ibn Qutayba, *Ta'wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth* (Cairo, 1386/1966), p. 313; Ibn Salāma, p. 22; Bayhaqī, *al-Sunan al-kubrā* (Hyderabad, 1354-56/1935-37), VIII, pp. 211, 213.

(18) *Itqān*, I, p. 206.

(19) Aḥmad, V, p. 183, quoting Zayd b. Thābit and Sa'īd b. al-'Āṣ; 'Abd al-Razzāq, *al-Muṣannaf*, ed. H. A'zamī (Johannesburg, 1970-72), VII, p. 330; *Itqān*, III, pp. 82, 86; *Idem*, *Durr*, V, p. 180, quoting Ubayy b. Ka'b and 'Ikrima.

(20) *Dājīn* can mean any kind of domestic animal, including fowl, sheep, or goat. A narrative in Ibrāhīm b. Ishāq al-Ḥarībī's (d. 285/898) *Gharīb al-ḥadīth* makes it more specific, as it uses the word *shāl*, that is, sheep or goat (see Zamakhsharī, *al-Kashshāf* [Cairo, 1947], III, p. 518, footnote). The same is Ibn Qutayba's understanding from the word *dājīn* (*Ta'wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*, p. 310), apparently because of the context, since it is said that the animal ate a sheet of paper. See

household was preoccupied with his funeral.⁽²¹⁾ 'Umar also remembered other verses he thought dropped out (*saqaṭa*) from the Qur'ān⁽²²⁾ or were lost, including one on being dutiful to parents⁽²³⁾ and another on *jihād*.⁽²⁴⁾ His claim regarding the first of the two was supported by three other early authorities on the Qur'ān: Zayd b. Thābit, 'Abd Allāh b. 'Abbās, and Ubayy b. Ka'b.⁽²⁵⁾ Anas b. Mālik remembered a verse which was revealed in the occasion of some Muslims who were killed in a battle, but was later "lifted."⁽²⁶⁾ 'Umar's learned son, 'Abd Allāh,⁽²⁷⁾ as well as some later scholars,⁽²⁸⁾ maintained that much of the Qur'ān had perished before the collection was made.

Similar reports specifically addressed the official 'Uthmānic recension of the Qur'ān. They reported that many prominent Companions could not find in that official text portions of the revelation they had themselves heard from the Prophet, or found them in a different form. Ubayy b. Ka'b, for instance, recited *sūra* 98 (*al-Bayyina*) in a form he claimed to have heard from the Prophet. It included two verses unrecorded in the 'Uthmānic text.⁽²⁹⁾ He also thought that the original version of *sūra* 33 (*al-*

also Sulaym b. Qays al-Hilālī, *Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays* (Najaf, n.d.), p. 108; al-Faḍl b. Shādhān, *al-Idāh*, ed. J. M. Urmawī (Tehran, 1972), p. 211; 'Abd al-Jalīl al-Qazwīnī, *al-Naqḍ*, ed. J. M. Urmawī (Tehran, 1980), p. 133.

(21) Aḥmad, VI, p. 269; Ibn Māja, I, p. 626; Ibn Qutayba, *Ta'wīl*, p. 310. See also Shāfi'ī, *Kitāb al-Umm* (Cairo, 1321-26/1903-8), V, p. 23, VII, p. 208.

(22) *Mabānī*, p. 99; *Itqān*, III, p. 84. (See also 'Abd al-Razzāq, VII, pp. 379-80; Ibn Abī Shayba, XIV, p. 564, where the expression *Faqadnāh*, "we lost it," is used.) The expression *saqaṭa* is also used by 'Ā'isha in the case of another phrase that allegedly "dropped out" from the Qur'ān. See Ibn Māja, I, p. 625 (see also *Itqān*, III, p. 70). It is also used by Mālik (Zarkashī, I, p. 263). Consider these two variations, too: (1) The Companion 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Awf and the *tābi'* 'Amr b. Dīnār said that certain sentences *usqīṭa* (were dropped) from the Qur'ān (Muḥāsibī, pp. 403, 408); (2) In a public sermon, 'Umar allegedly said that when the Prophet died, a part of the Qur'ān was "taken up" and another part remained, so we held onto a part and lost (*fālanā*) the other (Ibn Abī Shayba, VII, p. 431).

(23) 'Abd al-Razzāq, IX, p. 50; Aḥmad, I, pp. 47, 55; Ibn Abī Shayba, VII, p. 431; Bukhārī, IV, p. 306; Ibn Salāma, p. 22; *Itqān*, III, p. 84. See also Zarkashī, I, p. 39, where it is quoted from Abū Bakr.

(24) Muḥāsibī, p. 403; *Mabānī*, p. 99; *Itqān*, III, p. 84.

(25) 'Abd al-Razzāq, IX, p. 52; Muḥāsibī, p. 400; *Itqān*, III, p. 84.

(26) Muḥāsibī, p. 399; Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, II, p. 479.

(27) *Itqān*, III, pp. 81-82.

(28) Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 23, quoting Ibn Shihāb (al-Zuhri); *Itqān*, V, p. 179, quoting Sufyān al-Thawrī; Ibn Qutayba, *Ta'wīl*, p. 313. See also Ibn Lubb, *Fath al-bāb* (Beirut, 1981, in Wansharīsi's *al-Mi'yār*, XII, pp. 76-147), p. 92.

(29) Aḥmad, V, p. 132; Tirmidhī, p. 370; Ḥākim, II, p. 224; *Itqān*, III, p. 83.

Aḥzāb) had been much longer, from which he specifically remembered the stoning verse that is missing from the 'Uthmānic text.⁽³⁰⁾ His claim was supported by Zayd b. Thābit,⁽³¹⁾ by 'Ā'isha (who reported that during the Prophet's lifetime the *sūra* was about three times as long, although when 'Uthmān collected the Qur'ān he found only what was made available in his text),⁽³²⁾ and by Ḥudhayfa b. al-Yamān (who found some seventy verses missing in the new official text, verses that he himself used to recite during the lifetime of the Prophet).⁽³³⁾ Ḥudhayfa also contended that *sūra* 9 (*al-Barā'a*) in its 'Uthmānic form was perhaps one-fourth⁽³⁴⁾ or one-third⁽³⁵⁾ of what it had been during the time of the Prophet, an idea later supported by the prominent 2nd/8th century jurist and traditionist Mālik b. Anas, founder of the Mālikī school of Islamic law.⁽³⁶⁾ There are also reports that *sūras* 15 (*al-Ḥijr*) and 24 (*al-Nūr*) had once been of a different length.⁽³⁷⁾ And Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī recalled the existence of two long *sūras* (one verse of each he still remembered) that he could not find in the present text.⁽³⁸⁾ One of the two verses he recalled ('If the son of Adam had two fields of gold he would seek a third one ...') is also quoted from other Companions such as Ubayy,⁽³⁹⁾ Ibn Mas'ūd,⁽⁴⁰⁾ and Ibn 'Abbās.⁽⁴¹⁾ Maslama b. Mukhallad al-

(30) Aḥmad, V, p. 132; Muḥāsibī, p. 405; Bayhaqī, VIII, p. 211; Ḥākim, II, p. 415; *Itqān*, III, p. 82 (the same claim about the size of the *sūra* and that it included the stoning verse is quoted from 'Umar and 'Ikrima in Suyūṭī, *Durr*, V, p. 180). Compare with Zarkashī, II, p. 35 where the verse is said to have been in *sūra* 25 (*al-Nūr*), and with *Mabānī*, p. 82 where *sūra* 7 (*al-A'raf*) is mentioned instead. This latter is, however, a slip of pen or mis-spelling, as evidenced by the author's later mention of the *sūra* of *al-Aḥzāb* in pp. 83 and 86.

(31) Bayhaqī, VIII, p. 211.

(32) Al-Rāghib al-Iṣfahānī, *Muḥāḍarāt al-udabā'* (Beirut, 1961), IV, p. 434; Suyūṭī, *Durr*, V, p. 180; Idem, *Itqān*, III, p. 82.

(33) Suyūṭī, *Durr*, V, p. 180, quoting from Bukhārī's *Kitāb al-Ta'rīkh*.

(34) Ḥākim, II, p. 331; Haytamī, *Majma' al-zawā'id* (Cairo, 1352-53/1933-34), VII, pp. 28-29; *Itqān*, III, p. 84.

(35) Suyūṭī, *Durr*, III, p. 208.

(36) Zarkashī, I, p. 263; *Itqān*, I, p. 226.

(37) Sulaym, p. 108; Abū Manṣūr al-Ṭabrisī, *al-Iḥtijāj*, ed. M. B. Kharsān (Najf, 1966), I, pp. 222, 286, quoting the common belief among early Sunnites. See also Zarkashī, II, p. 35.

(38) Muslim, II, p. 726; Muḥāsibī, p. 405; Abū Nu'aym, *Ḥilyat al-awliyā'* (Cairo, 1932-38), I, p. 257; Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il*, VII, p. 156; *Itqān*, III, p. 83.

(39) Aḥmad, V, pp. 131-132; Muḥāsibī, pp. 400-401; Tirmidhī, V, p. 370; Ḥākim, II, p. 224.

(40) Rāghib, IV, p. 433.

(41) *Itqān*, I, p. 227.

Anṣārī offered two further verses that are not in the 'Uthmānic text,⁽⁴²⁾ and 'Ā'isha came forward with a third.⁽⁴³⁾ Two short chapters known as *Sūrat al-Ḥafd* and *Sūrat al-Khal'* were recorded in the collections of Ubayy,⁽⁴⁴⁾ Ibn 'Abbās, and Abū Mūsā.⁽⁴⁵⁾ They were allegedly also known to 'Umar⁽⁴⁶⁾ and other Companions,⁽⁴⁷⁾ although no trace of either chapter is found in the official text. Ibn Mas'ūd did not have *sūras* 1, 113, and 114 in his collection,⁽⁴⁸⁾ but he had some extra words and phrases that were missing from the 'Uthmānic text.⁽⁴⁹⁾ He and many other Companions also preserved some verses that differed from the official text.⁽⁵⁰⁾ There were also widely transmitted reports that after the death of the Prophet, 'Alī put all the parts of the Qur'ān together⁽⁵¹⁾ and presented it to the Companions; but they rejected it, and he had to take it back home.⁽⁵²⁾ These reports also suggested that there were substantial differences between the various versions of the Qur'ān.

*
**

It is universally acknowledged in the Islamic tradition—based on the collective memory of the early generations of Muslims

(42) *Ibid.*, III, p. 84.

(43) 'Abd al-Razzāq, VII, p. 470; Ibn Māja, I, pp. 625, 626.

(44) Muḥāsibī, p. 400-1; Ibn al-Nadīm, p. 30; Rāghib, IV, p. 433; Zarkashī, II, p. 37; Haytamī, VII, p. 157; *Itqān*, I, pp. 226, 227.

(45) *Itqān*, I, p. 227.

(46) *Ibid.*, I, p. 226-227.

(47) *Ibid.*, I, p. 227 (see also III, p. 85).

(48) Ibn Abī Shayba, VI, pp. 146-47; Aḥmad, V, pp. 129-30; Ibn Qutayba, *Ta'wīl mushkil al-Qur'ān*, ed. S. A. Ṣaqr (Cairo, 1954), pp. 33-34; Ibn al-Nadīm, p. 29; Bāqillānī, *al-Intiṣār* (Frankfurt, 1986), p. 184; Rāghib, IV, p. 434; Zarkashī, I, p. 251, II, p. 128; Haytamī, VII, pp. 149-50; *Itqān*, I, pp. 224, 226, 270-73.

(49) See Arthur Jeffery, *Materials for the History of the Text of the Qur'ān, the Old Codices* (Leiden, 1937), pp. 20-113.

(50) See the lists *ibid.*, pp. 114-238.

(51) Ibn Sa'd, II, p. 338; Ibn Abī Shayba, VI, p. 148; Ya'qūbī, II, p. 135; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 10; Ibn al-Nadīm, p. 30; Abū Hilāl al-'Askarī, I, pp. 219-20; Abū Nu'aym, I, p. 67; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, *al-Istī'āb* (Hyderabad, 1336-37/1918-19), pp. 333-34; Ibn Juzayy, I, p. 4; Ibn Abī 'l-Ḥadid, I, p. 27; *Itqān*, I, p. 204, 248. The Shī'ite version of this report asserts that he completed this within seven days after the death of the Prophet. See Kulaynī, *al-Kāfī*, ed. 'A. A. Ghaffārī (Tehran, 1377-79/1957-59), VIII, p. 18.

(52) Sulaym, pp. 72, 108; Ṣaffār, *Baṣā'ir al-darajāt* (Tabriz, 1381/1962), p. 193; Kulaynī, II, p. 633; Abū Manṣūr al-Ṭabrisī, I, pp. 107, 225-28; Ibn Shahrāshūb, *Manāqib Āl Abī Tālib* (Qum, 1378/1959), II, p. 42. See also Ya'qūbī, II, pp. 135-6.

rather than simply on a number of isolated reports—that ‘Uthmān promulgated an official rescension of the Qur’ān and banned all other versions. There were certainly differences between that official Qur’ān and other early codices as there were differences among the variant codices themselves. It was, after all, those differences that necessitated the establishment of a standard and universally accepted text.

It is conceivable that close associates of the Prophet, especially those who had joined him during his years in Mecca, still remembered parts of the revelation that had not been included by the Prophet in the Qur’ān. It is also plausible to speculate that ‘Alī—whose version of the Scripture might have been one of the most complete and authentic—had offered it to ‘Uthmān to be consecrated as the official text, but that his offer was rejected by the caliph who preferred to select and combine elements of all the competing early codices. This in turn may have caused ‘Alī to withdraw his manuscript as a basis for compiling of the official rescension. Another Companion, ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas’ūd, is also reported to have stood aloof from the process and to have declined to offer his own text.⁽⁵³⁾

The foregoing account of the first compilation of the Qur’ān is, otherwise, extremely problematic.⁽⁵⁴⁾ Despite the significance of this report, it does not appear in any work written by scholars of the 2nd/8th and early 3rd/9th centuries.⁽⁵⁵⁾ Some details of the story reportedly took place later at the time that ‘Uthmān ordered the creation of a standard Qur’ān.⁽⁵⁶⁾ Several reports categorically deny that any official attempt to collect the Qur’ān was made before ‘Uthmān’s time,⁽⁵⁷⁾ an assertion reportedly supported by

(53) See, for instance, Ibn Abī Dāwūd, pp. 15-17; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh madīnat Dimashq*, XXXIX, ed. S. Shihābī (Damascus, 1986), pp. 87-91.

(54) See A. T. Welch, pp. 404-5 and the sources quoted therein.

(55) Thus, the story does not appear for instance in Ibn Sa’d’s *Ṭabaqāt* in sections about Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and Zayd b. Thābit, nor in Ibn Ḥanbal’s *Musnad* or *Faḍa’il al-Ṣaḥāba* where he gathered so many reports about their virtues and good services to Islam.

(56) Cf. for instance, Bukhārī, III, pp. 392-93, IV, pp. 398-99; Tirmidhī, IV, p. 347; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, pp. 7, 8, 9, 20, 29, with Bukhārī, III, pp. 393-94; Tirmidhī, IV, p. 348; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, pp. 17, 19, 24-26, 31; Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh*, the biography of ‘Uthmān b. ‘Uffān, ed. S. al-Shihābī (Damascus, 1984), p. 236.

(57) See, for example, Ibn ‘Asākir, biography of ‘Uthmān, p. 170; Zarkashī, I, p. 241; *Itqān*, I, p. 248. Other reports suggest that the collection of the Qur’ān had already been started during the time of ‘Umar but that he died before the project was completed during the caliphate of ‘Uthman (Abū Hilāl al-‘Askarī, I,

the collective recollection of the Muslim community.⁽⁵⁸⁾ Different versions of the story reveal major contradictions in regards to some of its main particulars. The name of the Companion whose testimony alone was accepted⁽⁵⁹⁾ and the precise verses in question⁽⁶⁰⁾ vary. Contradictory accounts are also given of the role of Zayd b. Thābit in the compilation process.⁽⁶¹⁾ The inclusion of the clause related to the acceptance of the testimony of one man alone is an obvious attempt to make the story more acceptable through reference to the familiar and widely quoted story of Khuzayma Dhu 'l-Shahādātayn, a man whose single testimony was said to have been accepted by the Prophet as equivalent to the testimony of two witnesses.⁽⁶²⁾ In a variation of this story, in

p. 219). Another report asserts that 'Uthmān was the person who carried out the project but he did it during the reign of 'Umar (Ibn Sa'd, II (2): 113; Ibn 'Asākir, biography of 'Uthmān, p. 171.)

(58) Zarkashī, I, p. 235; *Itqān*, I, p. 211 (see also Ibn 'Asākir, *op. cit.*, pp. 243-46).

(59) He is (a) Khuzayma b. Thābit al-Anṣārī in Bukhārī, III, p. 310, 394; Tirmidhī, IV, p. 347; Abū Bakr al-Marwazī, p. 103; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, pp. 7, 8, 9, 20, 29, 31; Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il*, VII, p. 150, but (b) Abū Khuzayma (Aws b. Yazīd) in Bukhārī, III, pp. 392-93, (c) al-Hārith b. Khuzayma in Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 30, (d) Khuzayma or Abū Khuzayma in Bukhārī, VI, p. 399; Tirmidhī, IV, p. 348; Abū Bakr al-Marwazī, p. 99; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 19; Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il*, VII, p. 149, (e) an unidentified man of Anṣār in Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 8; Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, XIV, p. 588, and (f) Ubayy in Ibn Abī Dāwūd, pp. 9, 30; Khaṭīb, *Talkhīṣ al-Mulashābih*, I, p. 403. There are also other reports which indicate that Ubayy not only knew these verses he knew that they were the last to have been revealed to the Prophet, too (Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, XIV, pp. 588-89; Khaṭīb, *loc. cit.*).

(60) It is the last two verses of *sūra* 9 in Bukhārī, III, pp. 392-93; Tirmidhī, IV, p. 347; Abū Bakr al-Marwazī, pp. 99, 103; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, pp. 7, 9, 11, 20, 29, 30, 31; Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, XIV, p. 588; Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il*, VII, p. 149, but verse 23 of *sūra* 33 in Bukhārī, III, pp. 310, 393-94; Tirmidhī, IV, p. 348; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, pp. 8, 19; Bayhaqī, *Dalā'il*, VII, p. 150; Khaṭīb, *Mūḍih*, I, p. 276.

(61) In the above-cited account of the collection of the Qur'ān he is the one who undertook the task of putting the Qur'ān together in two stages during the times of Abū Bakr and 'Uthmān. Some other reports ascribe the collection of the Qur'ān, including Zayd's participation in it, to the Period of 'Uthmān (Bukhārī, III, pp. 393-94; Tirmidhī, IV, p. 348; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 31. See also Ibn 'Asākir, biography of 'Uthmān, pp. 234-36). Other reports do not mention his name at all (Ibn Abī Dāwūd, pp. 10-11). Yet others assert that he had already collected the Qur'ān during the time of the Prophet, putting together all fragments of it which were already recorded on various sorts of primitive writing material (Tirmidhī, V, p. 390; Hākim, II, pp. 229, 611). In another report, however, he is quoted as stating that by the time the Prophet died, the Qur'ān had not yet been collected (*Itqān*, I, p. 202).

(62) See Bukhārī, III, p. 310; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 29; Khaṭīb, *Mūḍih*, I, p. 276; *Itqān*, I, p. 206.

which the witness is an unidentified man from Anṣār, ‘Umar is reported to have accepted the testimony of this single witness on the grounds that the message of the verse he offered was, in ‘Umar’s judgement, true since the verse described the Prophet with qualities that he had really possessed.⁽⁶³⁾ In other variations, the verse or verses were said to have been accepted because ‘Umar,⁽⁶⁴⁾ ‘Uthmān,⁽⁶⁵⁾ or Zayd⁽⁶⁶⁾ themselves testified that they, too, had heard those verses from the Prophet; or, alternatively, because the caliph had generally ordered that anybody’s testimony be accepted provided that he took an oath that he had personally heard from the Prophet the verse or part that he offered for inclusion.⁽⁶⁷⁾ Moreover, the story contradicts numerous and widely transmitted reports⁽⁶⁸⁾ which assert that a number of the Companions, notably ‘Alī, ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd and Ubayy b. Ka‘b, had

(63) Tabarī, *Jāmi‘*, XVI, p. 588.

(64) Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 30.

(65) *Ibid.*, p. 31.

(66) *Ibid.*, pp. 8, 19, 29.

(67) Ibn ‘Asākir, *op. cit.*, p. 236 where the episode is ascribed to the period of ‘Uthmān who asked the Muslims to come forward with whatever part of the Qur’ān they had in hand. The Muslims came forward with whatever primitive writing material on which they had recorded parts of the Qur’ān. Then ‘Uthmān asked every single one to swear that he had personally heard what he had offered as a part of the Qur’ān from the Prophet. He then ordered the collected material to be put together as the Scripture.

In an obvious attempt to purge the story of some of these terrible contradictions a variation of it was authored by some later transmitters that suggested that (a) the collection of the Qur’ān started during the reign of Abū Bakr but could not be completed before his death and was put together during the reign of ‘Umar, that (b) Zayd was the one who wrote the Qur’ān first during the time of Abū Bakr on primitive writing material and then during the time of ‘Umar on paper, that (c) there was no question of testimony and witness, but rather Zayd himself after completing the text once went over it and could not find the verse 33:23. He then looked around for it until he found the record of it with Khuzayma b. Thābit. He then went over the text once more and this time noticed that the verses 9: 128-129 were missing, so he looked around again until he found the record with another man who was incidentally called Khuzayma as well (*sic.* = Abū Khuzayma?). When he went over the text for the third time he found no problem and so the text was completed (Tabarī, *Jāmi‘*, I: 59-61).

(68) The list of the early collectors of the Qur’ān is different in different sources. Cf., for instance, Ibn Sa’d, II (2), pp. 112-114; Ibn al-Nadīm, *Kitāb al-Fihrist*, ed. R. Tajaddud (Tehran, 1971), p. 30; Tabarānī, *al-Mu’jam al-kabīr*, ed. Ḥ. A. Salafī (Baghdad, 1978), II, p. 292; Bāqillānī, pp. 88-90; Dhahabī, *Ma’rifat al-qurrā’ al-kibār*, ed. B. ‘A. Ma’rūf *et al.* (Beirut, 1984), I, p. 27; Zarkashī, I pp. 242-43; Qurṭubī, I, p. 57; *Itqān*, I, pp. 248-49, quoting Abū ‘Ubayd in his *Kitāb al-Qirā’āl*.

collected the Qur'ān during the time of the Prophet.⁽⁶⁹⁾ Furthermore, a clear and suspicious attempt seems to have been made to somehow credit the first three caliphs with achieving the compilation of the sacred scripture of Islam to the exclusion of the fourth, 'Alī.

*
**

This latter point, when compared with the reports cited above on 'Alī's collection of the Qur'ān after the death of the Prophet, may shed some light on the origins of the story. Taking into account some of the early political, and later polemical, disputes within the Muslim community, one may suggest the existence of a multi-stage process in the formation of that account. There was apparently a widely circulating rumor in the first century of the *Hijra* to the effect that 'Alī did not attend the public meeting at which Abū Bakr was declared ruler after the death of the Prophet, and that it also took some time before he swore his allegiance to Abū Bakr. From early times the partisans of 'Alī have interpreted this as a reflection of his dissatisfaction with the choice of Abū Bakr and used this conclusion as a basis from which to attack the alleged consensus of the Companions which was put forward by the supporters of the caliphs as the legal basis for the validity of Abū Bakr's succession to caliphate. This line of argument seems to have appeared quite early; possibly even before the decline of the Umayyads in the early 2nd/8th century when sectarian debates began to flare in the Muslim community.⁽⁷⁰⁾ With the decline of the Umayyads, 'Alī could no longer be ignored and a response had to be found. Many of the reports which alleged that 'Alī retreated from public life after the death of the Prophet in order to put the Qur'ān together mention this as the explanation for his failure to

(69) In order to remove the obvious contradiction between these reports and the story in question, the supporters of the story have offered two suggestions. According to one, those who are said to have collected the Qur'ān during the time of the Prophet had each made a collection of only a part of the revelation, not a complete version. According to the other, the word "collected" had to be understood to mean that those Companions memorized the Qur'ān during the time of the Prophet, not that they put a complete record of it together (Ibn Abi Dāwūd, p. 10; *Ilqān*, I, p. 204).

(70) See, for instance, the poem attributed to 'Alī in the Sharif al-Raḍī, *Nahj al-balāgha*, ed. Ṣ. Ṣāliḥ (Beirut, 1967-68), p. 503: "If you (claim that you) have come to power on the basis of consultation, how did then it happen while those who had to be consulted were absent?"

tender an early allegiance to the caliph.⁽⁷¹⁾ It seems very likely,⁽⁷²⁾ therefore, that these reports were composed—using as background material some pre-existing reports and recollections concerning ‘Alī⁽⁷³⁾—for the sectarian purpose of suggesting that ‘Alī’s delay was not a sign of his dissatisfaction. Instead, ‘Alī was quoted as telling Abū Bakr (when the caliph asked him whether he had failed to swear allegiance because he was unhappy with Abū Bakr’s election) that he “‘had vowed to God not to put on his outside garment, except for attending the communal prayer, until such a time as he had put the Qur’ān together.”⁽⁷⁴⁾

The episode, however, created other problems for the supporters of orthodoxy for it added another item to the list of ‘Alī’s special privileges used by the Shī’ites to argue with for his claim to the caliphate. In addition to all his other alleged merits, he was now the one who had undertaken the critical task of assembling the Islamic scripture after the death of the Prophet.⁽⁷⁵⁾ This was potentially a dangerous weapon in the hands of his partisans in

(71) Ibn Sa’d, II (2), p. 101; Ibn Abī Shayba, VI, p. 148; Abū Hilāl al-‘Askarī, I, pp. 219-20; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 10; *Ilqān*, I, p. 204.

(72) Alternatively, there might actually have existed rumors suggesting that ‘Alī, having noticed that the seniors of Quraysh had chosen one among themselves as the successor to the Prophet and having decided to withdraw from the public, kept himself busy with the Qur’ān and took that as an excuse not to participate in any social activity. The Sunnites, however, put forward that excuse as the real cause and denied that ‘Alī was unhappy with the Quraysh’s process of caliph making.

(73) ‘Alī was among the early collectors of the Qur’ān, *i.e.*, one of those who collected it during the lifetime of the Prophet (see also Ibn ‘Asākir, XXXIX, p. 80). ‘Alī was known for his vast knowledge of and special dedication to the Qur’ān (see, for instance, Ibn Sa’d, II (2), p. 101). In his codex of the Qur’ān he had reportedly indicated the verses which were abrogated and those which abrogated them (*Ilqān*, I, p. 204). The exact timing of when he had offered his codex for the official consecration was already blurred by the early 2nd/8th century. The Shī’ites themselves were now attributing it to the time of ‘Umar (Sulaym, p. 108, also quoted in Abū Maṣṣūr al-Ṭabrisī, I, p. 228, II, p. 7), but a vague memory of it was presumably still extant.

(74) See above, note 71. The point that these reports had an anti-Shī’ite polemic application can be also attested to by the fact that in some of its later versions, the report is quoted by the Sunnites on the authority of Ja’far al-Šādiq, who quoted it from his forefathers (Abū Hilāl al-‘Askarī, I, p. 219). It was a common practice in the sectarian reports to put the idea on the tongue of respected authorities of the opponent, a practice which can be also observed in the cases which shortly follow in the discussion above (see also Kashshī, pp. 393-97 for another example).

(75) See, as one example, *Kitāb Miḥnal Amīr al-Mu’minīn* (an early Shī’ite text preserved in Pseudo-Mufīd, *al-Ikhlāṣ* [Najaf, 1971], pp. 157-75), p. 164; Sulaym: 113, 220.

sectarian debates. The partisans of 'Alī might have already used it against the 'Uthmāniyya, to counter their argument in support of 'Uthmān on the basis that he was the one who established the official and standard Qur'ān. For the 'Uthmāniyya that constituted a real challenge that they met, as in many other cases, by seeking to undermine Shi'ite claims for the special quality of 'Alī or the House of the Prophet. Some examples are as follows:⁽⁷⁶⁾

1. Many reports suggest that the Prophet chose 'Alī as his brother⁽⁷⁷⁾ at the time that he established the "brothering" among his followers.⁽⁷⁸⁾ A counter report claims this status for Abū Bakr,⁽⁷⁹⁾ though it is widely believed that the Prophet made Abū Bakr and 'Umar brothers.⁽⁸⁰⁾ Many other reports quote the Prophet as saying that "if I could adopt an intimate friend I would adopt Abū Bakr, but your colleague (i.e. the Prophet) is already taken by God as His intimate friend."⁽⁸¹⁾ These seem to have been composed to counter the claim of 'Alī's selection as the Prophet's brother.

2. The partisans of 'Alī regarded him as the most excellent among the companions of the Prophet. Indeed, there are many indications in the history of the Prophet that 'Alī was in fact one of the pre-eminent Companions. An obviously pro-'Uthmāniyya report, however, emphasized that during the time of the Prophet only Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān were pre-eminent. All others followed with no distinctions of status or eminence.⁽⁸²⁾

3. In an oft-quoted statement ascribed to the Prophet, he is reported as having called his two grandsons by Fāṭima—al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn—the "two masters of the youth of Para-

(76) For some other interesting examples see Ibn 'Asākir, biography of 'Uthmān, pp. 146-68, 290-94.

(77) See the many early sources mentioned in Nūr Allāh al-Tustarī, *Iḥqāq al-ḥaqq* (Tehran, 1957-), IV, pp. 171-217, VI, pp. 461-86, XV, pp. 450-517, XX, pp. 221-55; 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Aminī, III, pp. 113-25.

(78) See the article *Mu'ākhāt* in the *Encyclopaedia of Islām*, 2nd ed., VII, pp. 253-54.

(79) Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal, *Faḍā'il al-ṣaḥāba*, ed. W. M. 'Abbās (Beirut, 1983), pp. 99, 166-7, 378; Bukhārī, II, p. 418; Daylamī, I, pp. 529-30.

(80) Ibn Sa'd, III (1), p. 123.

(81) See Aḥmad, *Faḍā'il*, pp. 99, 166-67, 177, 183-84, 378-79, 411 and other sources mentioned in the editor's footnote in p. 99.

(82) *Ibid.*, pp. 86-92 and the sources mentioned in the editor's footnote; Ibn 'Asākir, biography of 'Uthmān, pp. 153-59 (see also Bukhārī, II, p. 418).

dise.”⁽⁸³⁾ Another report from the Prophet applies the same epithet to ‘Alī.⁽⁸⁴⁾ A counter report calls Abū Bakr and ‘Umar the “two masters of the middle-aged of the Paradise.”⁽⁸⁵⁾

4. A widely circulating statement attributed to the Prophet stated that he was the city of knowledge for which ‘Alī was the gate.⁽⁸⁶⁾ A counter statement described Abū Bakr as the foundation of the city, ‘Umar as the wall and ‘Uthmān as the ceiling (*sic.*).⁽⁸⁷⁾

5. It is reported that during the early years of the Prophet’s stay at Medina, the Companions who had their houses around the mosque of the Prophet had opened exit doors from their houses into the mosque in order to make it easier for themselves to attend the communal prayer there with the Prophet. According to a widely quoted report, the Prophet later ordered all those doors to be closed, excepting only the door that led from the house of ‘Alī, which was virtually the door leading from the house of the Prophet’s daughter.⁽⁸⁸⁾ (The exception was not, therefore, to signify a merit or to establish a special status for ‘Alī himself.) A counter report, however, tried to establish that it was the door from the house of Abū Bakr which was the exception.⁽⁸⁹⁾

6. It is unanimously believed that during a ceremonial imprecation that took place between the Prophet and the Christians of Najrān towards the end of the Prophet’s life,⁽⁹⁰⁾ he brought with him the members of his immediate family: ‘Alī, Fāṭima, and their two sons.⁽⁹¹⁾ This clearly followed the traditional rules for the Arabs’ custom of the mutual curse, which required each party to

(83) See the many sources quoted in Tustarī, X, pp. 544-95, XIX, pp. 232-51.

(84) Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rīkh madīnat Dimashq*, the section on the biography of ‘Alī, ed. M. B. Maḥmūdī (Beirut, 1975), II, p. 260.

(85) Ibn Sa’d, III (1), p. 124; Aḥmad, *Faḍā’il*, pp. 158-59, 771, 774, 780, 788; Daylamī, I, p. 530.

(86) See the many sources quoted in Tustarī, V, pp. 468-515, XVI, pp. 277-309, XXI, pp. 415-28; Amīnī, VI, pp. 61-81.

(87) Daylamī, I, p. 76.

(88) See the many sources quoted in Aḥmad, *Faḍā’il*, pp. 581-82, editor’s footnote; Tustarī, V, pp. 540-86, XVI, pp. 332-75, XXI, pp. 243-55; Amīnī, VI, pp. 209-16.

(89) Bukhārī, II, p. 418; Aḥmad, *Faḍā’il*, pp. 70-71 (and other sources mentioned in the editor’s footnote), 98, 152, 379.

(90) See the article *mubāhala* in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed., VII, pp. 276-77.

(91) See the many sources quoted in Tustarī, III, pp. 46-62, IX, pp. 70-91, XIV, pp. 131-47, XX, pp. 84-87.

attend in the company of his own household. A counter report, however, asserts that the Prophet was accompanied to the ceremony by Abū Bakr and his family, 'Umar and his family and 'Uthmān and his family.⁽⁹²⁾

7. According to a widely transmitted report, the Prophet described Fāṭima, 'Alī and their two sons as constituting his own household.⁽⁹³⁾ This definition of the Prophet's house is supported by almost all early Muslim authorities.⁽⁹⁴⁾ A clearly pro-'Uthmāniyya report, however, quoted the Prophet as saying that 'Alī, al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn and Fāṭima were his own household while Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān and 'Ā'isha were the household of God.⁽⁹⁵⁾

It seems safe to assume that this same model was followed with respect to the reports about 'Alī's collection of the Qur'ān and that the story in question was composed as part of an anti-Shī'ite polemic. The process seems to have begun with assertions that, with the exception of 'Uthmān, none of the caliphs or any of the Companions collected the Qur'ān;⁽⁹⁶⁾ some made the point more emphatically and stipulated that 'Alī, in particular, passed away before he could collect it.⁽⁹⁷⁾ (In reality, of course, not only did 'Alī witness the collection of the Qur'ān, he did not die until years after the official Qur'ān had been established.) Another report asserted that the first person to collect the Qur'ān was Sālim, a client of Abū Ḥudhayfa, who after the death of the Prophet "vowed to God not to put on his outside garment until such a time as he had put the Qur'ān together."⁽⁹⁸⁾ This is exactly the statement attributed to 'Alī in other reports. Sālim was among those who lost their lives in the battle of Yamāma.⁽⁹⁹⁾ Other reports came forward with the straightforward assertion that the first to

(92) Ibn 'Asākir, biography of 'Uthmān, pp. 168-69, quoting on the authority of Imām Ja'far al-Šādiq, who accordingly related it from his father. As noted above, this was a common phenomenon in this genre of material which was authored for anti-Shī'ite polemical purposes.

(93) Tustarī, II, pp. 501-62, III, pp. 513-31, IX, pp. 1-69, XIV, pp. 40-105, XVIII, pp. 359-83.

(94) See Ṭabarī, *Jāmi' al-bayān* (Cairo, 1954), XXII, pp. 6-8.

(95) Daylamī, I, p. 532. Ṭabarī, *Jāmi'*, XXII, p. 8 quotes that 'Ikrima, a *tābi'* well-known for his anti-'Alid tendencies, was "crying in the market" that the household of the Prophet were his wives only.

(96) See above, footnote 57.

(97) Ibn 'Asākir, biography of 'Uthmān, p. 170.

(98) *Ḥqān*, I, p. 205 quoting Ibn Ashta in his *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif*.

(99) Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, p. 562.

collect the Qur'ān was Abū Bakr.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ Employing popular beliefs among Muslims concerning 'Uthmān's establishment of the standard Qur'ān—including the role of Zayd b. Thābit as the project's main coordinator—the role of Abū Bakr in the collection of the Qur'ān was then developed to what is seen in the above-cited account which, at the same time, reserves a major role for 'Umar, as well, in the process.

*
**

The old rumours that some of the Companions had allegedly remembered parts of the revelation that they could not find in the Scripture had perhaps already been blurred and directed to the official 'Uthmānic text even before the above-cited story was authored. With the establishment of the notion that no complete version of the Qur'ān existed by the time the Prophet died, these rumors came to be firmly attached to the 'Uthmānic text. Suggestions that some verses and parts were missing challenged the authority of 'Uthmānic text of the Qur'ān, which was accepted as the sacred scripture of Islam by Muslims of every tendency or sect. Nevertheless, such stories remained popular in the Sunnite tradition⁽¹⁰¹⁾ and were quoted by many "reliable" Sunnite transmitters of *ḥadīth*. Over time, the material concerning alleged omissions and alterations in the Qur'ānic text grew into monographs of considerable size in Sunnite literature.⁽¹⁰²⁾ Thus, the idea that the 'Uthmānic codex was incomplete began as a logical conclusion of what most likely started as a sectarian attempt by the Sunnites and thus was first a purely Sunnite concept.⁽¹⁰³⁾ Aspects of this idea, such as the allegation that non-Qur'ānic materials were

(100) Ibn Abī Shayba, VI, p. 148; Ibn Abī Dāwūd, p. 5, both quoting the report on the authority of 'Alī.

(101) See, for instance, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Sayyārī, *Kilāb al-Qirā'āt* = *Kilāb al-tanzīl wa 'l-tahrīf*, MS 1455, Mar'ashī Library, Qum, fol. 44b: *inna 'l-nās* (the Sunnites) *yaqūlūna qad dhahaba min sūratī 'l-Aḥzābī shay'un kathīr*; al-Faḍl b. Shādhān, p. 107; *qālatī 'l-Murjī'a fa-la'alla baqiyyata 'l-aḥkāmi fi 'l-Qur'āni 'lladhī dhahab*.

(102) See Ibn al-Nadīm, pp. 38-39; also Labīb al-Sa'id, *al-Jam' al-ṣawtī al-awwal li 'l-Qur'ān* (Cairo, 1978), pp. 320-21.

(103) See especially Bāqillānī, pp. 277-80 where he repeatedly stresses the point that all reports about the alleged omissions and alterations in the text of the Qur'ān are quoted on the authority of 'Ā'isha, Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī and the like, Companions that the Shī'ites do not recognize as true Muslims and have, therefore, no right to argue with the statements of those Companions against the Sunnites.

added to this text as the Sunnite authors ascribe to 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd,⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ rarely found any support among other Islamic sects.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ It did, however, provide grounds for a splinter group of the Khārijites, the Maymūniyya, to claim that the *sūra* on Joseph (*sūra* 12) was not part of the Qur'ān.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾

The attempt eventually brought more problems for the Sunnites than it solved as their opponents now argued with the alleged alteration in the 'Uthmānic text against them in polemical debates. This was certainly true with the Shi'ites who were probably already suspicious about the circumstances of the promulgation of the official text and thought that some tampering with the text might have occurred in the process by those who took the charge of the preparation of that official rescension. Faced with this challenge, Sunnite scholars later began to distance themselves from the early reports and, instead, emphasized the incorruptibility of the text of the Qur'ān. They later forbade quotation of and reference to that genre of early material even when it was transmitted by their own reliable chains of authority.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ Hence the whole idea, which had its genesis within the Sunnite community, was gradually transformed into an anti-Sunnite allegation. Since the Sunnites could not dismiss all of the traditions of this category—many of which were quoted by their own widely accepted and reliable chains of authority—they formulated new categories of abrogation, where a verse was physically removed though people still remembered it,⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ to explain the absence of

(104) See above, note 48.

(105) The idea was, however, supported in the Sunnite tradition as late as the 7th/13th century. See, for instance, Qurtubī, I, p. 81, who quotes a contemporary who maintained that 'Uthmān and the Companions *zādū fi 'l-Qur'ān mā laysa minhu*.

(106) Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* (Cairo, 1950), I, p. 166; Isfarā'īnī, *al-Tabṣīr fi 'l-dīn* (Beirut, 1983), p. 140; Shahrastānī, *al-Milal wa 'l-niḥal* (Beirut, 1981), p. 55; Maqdisī, *al-Bad' wa 'l-ta'rīkh*, ed. M. C. Huart (Paris, 1899-1919), V, p. 138; Ibn 'Abbād, *al-Kashf 'an manāḥij aṣnāf al-Khawārij*, ed. M. T. Dānish-pazhūh (Tabriz, 1968, in *Nashriyya-yi Dānishkada-yi Adabiyyāt-i Tabriz*, XX, pp. 145-50), p. 146; Qalqashandī, *Ṣubḥ al-a'shā* (Cairo, 1913-20), XIII, p. 223; Abū Muḥammad al-'Irāqī, *al-Firaq al-muḥṭarīqa*, ed. Y. Kutluay (Ankara, 1961), p. 24. This claim has also been attributed to the entire 'Ajārida subsect of the Khārijites. See Shahrastānī, p. 55.

(107) Zarkashī, II, p. 127. See also Ibn Lubb, p. 96.

(108) At the time Abū 'Ubayd (d. 224/838-9) wrote his work on abrogation, these categories had not been suggested (see his *al-Nāsikh wa 'l-mansūkh*, pp. 5-6; also Naḥḥās, *al-Nāsikh wa 'l-mansūkh* [Cairo, 1905], p. 8). A few decades later, however, al-Ḥārith b. Asad al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/857-8) suggested two categories of abro-

the alleged missing materials from the 'Uthmānic text. That formula has remained valid up to the present.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾

*
**

The cornerstone of the faith in Shī'ite thought is allegiance (*wilāya*) to the Imāms of the household of the Prophet (the '*Itira* or *Ahl al-Bayt*). It is considered as the most important element, and superior to any other component, of the '*sharī'a*.⁽¹¹⁰⁾ Shī'ism believed in the exceptional virtue, first, of 'Alī as the most qualified to succeed the Prophet and, afterward, of the Imāms descended from him as the true heads of the religion in their times. The Qur'ān, however, does not contain a single explicit, unequivocal reference to any of these positions. Indeed, early sectarian debaters frequently posed the question: if 'Alī and his descendants were really of such central importance, why were their names and religious positions not clearly mentioned in the Qur'ān?⁽¹¹¹⁾

gation, the verse to have been removed from the Scripture in both though the people still remembered it. In one of the two categories (*mā nusikha hukmuḥu wa tilāwatuhu*) the law introduced by the abrogated verse was also abrogated (Muḥāsibī, *Fahm al-Qur'ān*, p. 407), but in the other (*mā nusikhat tilāwatuhu wa baqiya hukmuḥu*) the law continued to exist despite the fact that the verse itself was removed (*ibid.*, p. 398). This unusual situation was suggested to accommodate reports related to the stoning verse, since it was believed that the law of stoning was still valid though the verse was dropped from the Scripture. Ibn al-Munādī (d. 334/745-6) in his book on abrogation (quoted in Zarkashī, II, p. 37; *Itqān*, III, p. 85) and Abū Ja'far al-Naḥḥās (d. 338/950) in his *al-Nāsikh wa 'l-mansūkh*, p. 8, both quoted this classification and pointed out that other scholars rejected it as they considered the idea to be the same as that which suggested that the 'Uthmānic rescension was incomplete (see also Bāqillānī, p. 266; Ibn Ḥafar, *al-Yanbū'*, quoted in *Itqān*, III, p. 86). It was, however, gradually accepted in the Sunnite tradition (see Ibn Salāma, pp. 21-22; Zarkashī, II, p. 37; *Itqān*, III, pp. 85-86). For the adoption of the theory by some Shī'ite scholars, see Sadīd al-Dīn al-Ḥimmaṣī, *al-Munqidh min al-taqlīd* [Qum, 1411/1991], I, p. 480).

(109) See Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ, pp. 259-74.

(110) See Barqī, *al-Maḥāsīn*, ed. J. M. Urmawī (Tehran, 1370/1951), p. 286; 'Ayyāshī, *Kitāb al-Tafsīr*, ed. H. Rasūlī (Qum, 1380-81/1960-61), I, pp. 191, 259, 293; Kulaynī, II, pp. 18-19; Ibn Bābawayh, *Kitāb al-Khiṣāl*, ed. 'A. A. Ghaffārī (Tehran, 1389/1969), p. 278.

(111) See, for instance, 'Ayyāshī, I, pp. 249-50 and Kulaynī, I, p. 286, both quoting a conversation between Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq and one of his disciples in which the disciple says: "The people ask us why the names of 'Alī and his family are not mentioned in the Book of God"; and Sayyārī, who quotes a disciple of Imām 'Alī al-Riḍā writing to the Imām that "some people have asked me where the name

Some Sunnite reports on the collection of the Qur'ān suggested that earlier versions of the Scripture had contained passages mentioning the name of 'Alī or the prominent position of the House of the Prophet which are not found in the 'Uthmānic codex. Some examples are as follows:

1. Qur'ān 5:67 reads: "O Messenger, deliver whatever has been sent down to you by your Lord. If you do not do so, you will not have conveyed His message. God will defend you from mankind." Sunnite⁽¹¹²⁾ and Shī'ite reports suggest that the verse was revealed during the Prophet's last pilgrimage to Mecca, in the year 10/632, in reference to 'Alī's special virtues, and that the Prophet subsequently declared 'Alī the *mawlā* of the Muslims. (There is, of course, a sharp difference of opinion over what the word *mawlā* meant in that context.) Nevertheless, the name of 'Alī is not mentioned in that verse, or anywhere else in the Qur'ān. A Sunnite report, however, maintains that 'Alī's name and the intent of the passage were explicitly mentioned in the verse as recorded by Ibn Mas'ūd, since it read: "O Messenger, deliver whatever has been sent down to you by your Lord that 'Alī is *mawlā* of the faithful."⁽¹¹³⁾

2. Qur'ān 3:33 reads: "God selected Adam and Noah, Abraham's House and 'Imrān's House over [everyone in] the Universe." In Ibn Mas'ūd's record, this list also included the House of Muḥammad.⁽¹¹⁴⁾

3. Qur'ān 56:10-12 read: "And the pioneers will be out there leading. Those will be the nearest in gardens of bliss." 23:8-11 read: "And those who preserve their trusts and their pledge, and who attend to their prayers, will be the heirs who shall inherit Paradise to live there forever." The collections of Ibn Mas'ūd, Ubayy and al-Rabī' b. Khuthaym contained a different phrasing that combined elements of the two above verses: "And the pioneers to believe in the Prophet are 'Alī and his descendants whom God selected from among his [the Prophet's] companions and made

of 'Alī occurs in the Book of God" (fol. 35b). Also Jāḥiẓ, *al-'Uthmāniyya*, ed. 'A. M. Hārūn (Cairo, 1955), p. 273: "We looked through the Qur'ān from beginning to end and could not find a single verse on the imamate of 'Alī."

(112) See, for instance, 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī, I, pp. 214-23, where that account is quoted from some thirty Sunnite authorities. Also Suyūṭī, *Durr*, II, p. 298.

(113) Suyūṭī, *Durr*, II, p. 298; Jeffery, p. 40. See also Bahā' al-Dīn al-Irbilī, *Kashf al-ghumma* (Tabriz, 1381/1962), I, p. 317, quoting this from Sunnite sources.

(114) Jeffery, p. 32.

mawlā over everyone else; those will be the triumphant who shall inherit Paradise to live there for ever.”⁽¹¹⁵⁾

4. Qur’ān 25:1 reads: “Blessed is the One who has sent down the Standard [= the Qur’ān] to His servant so he may act as a warner to everyone in the Universe.” In the codex of Ubayy the verse appeared with additions: “Blessed is the One who has sent down the Standard to His messenger and the House of his descendant who inherited the knowledge of the Book after him, so they may act as warners for everyone in the Universe.”⁽¹¹⁶⁾

5. Qur’ān 24:35 reads: “god is the Light of Heaven and Earth. His light may be compared to a niche in which there is a lamp, the lamp is in a glass, the glass is just as if it were a glittering star kindled from a blessed olive tree...” Ibn Mas’ūd’s record here was allegedly different, reading: “The light of those who believed in Him and loved the House of His messenger may be compared to a niche...”⁽¹¹⁷⁾

Likewise the mention and approbation of ‘Alī and the House of the Prophet are said to have appeared in other places in early codices as, for instance, in Ibn Mas’ūd’s codex in 33:25,⁽¹¹⁸⁾ 56⁽¹¹⁹⁾ (this latter also in the codex of Mu’ādh b. Jabal)⁽¹²⁰⁾ 42:22-23,⁽¹²¹⁾ 59:7,⁽¹²²⁾ 61:14 (according to the reading of al-Rabī’ b. Khuthaym),⁽¹²³⁾ 74:36,⁽¹²⁴⁾ and 97:4.⁽¹²⁵⁾

Reports such as these provided the early Shī’ite *mutakallimūn* with a ready weapon to silence their opponents, arguing that “were it not that the text of the Qur’ān has been altered, people would clearly see in it the proofs of the right of the House of the Prophet.”⁽¹²⁶⁾ References to those different Sunnite readings of the Qur’ān appear frequently in early sectarian debates between Sunnites and Shī’ites. The Sunnite narratives about the collection of

(115) *Ibid.*, pp. 97, 168, 306.

(116) *Ibid.*, p. 150.

(117) *Ibid.*, p. 65.

(118) *Ibid.*, p. 75.

(119) *Ibid.*, p. 76.

(120) *Ibid.*, p. 336.

(121) *Ibid.*, p. 86.

(122) *Ibid.*, p. 100.

(123) *Ibid.*, p. 308.

(124) *Ibid.*, p. 353.

(125) *Ibid.*, p. 110.

(126) Sayyārī, fol. 2a; ‘Ayyāshī, I, p. 13. See also Mufīd, *al-Masā’il al-Sarāwiyya* (Qum [1979], in the collection of ‘*Iddat rasā’il li ‘l-Shaykh... al-Mufīd*, pp. 207-32), p. 225.

the Qur'ān (including 'Umar's claim that a part of it was lost because of the death of the original memorizers, the story of the domestic animal that ate a sheet of paper on which some Qur'ānic verses were recorded, and Sunniite claims about the original length of several *sūras*) are used in the *Kitāb Sulaym b. Qays*, a Shī'ite work originally dating from the first decades of the 2nd/8th century, in a polemical debate against the first caliphs.⁽¹²⁷⁾

Two of the most famous Shī'ite debaters of the late 2nd/8th century, Hishām b. al-Ḥakam⁽¹²⁸⁾ and Hishām b. Sālim,⁽¹²⁹⁾ reportedly used the Sunniite idea of the alteration of the text of the Qur'ān in their sectarian debates. Abū 'Isā al-Warrāq (d. 247/861-62), a controversial theologian with Shī'ite tendencies, is said to have written a book entitled *Kitāb al-Ḥukm 'alā sūrat Lam yakun*.⁽¹³⁰⁾ The title of this work indicates that the author had used against the Sunnites themselves the Sunniite narratives⁽¹³¹⁾ concerning omissions from *sūra* 98 (which was believed to have originally contained unfavorable statements about some notables of Quraysh,⁽¹³²⁾ possibly understood by Shī'ite debaters as having included some of the Companions). Al-Faḍl b. Shādhān al-Naysābūrī (d. 260/873) devoted a full section of his *Kitāb al-Īdāḥ* to attacking the Ḥashwiyya (traditionists) of the Sunnites for this kind of reports that could discredit the holy scripture of Islam.⁽¹³³⁾ He also challenged the basis of their arguments with what they believed to be the Prophet's tradition by asking: "Does it make sense that you lose the greater part of the Qur'ān but manage to keep the Prophet's tradition intact? Are you sure that you did not fail in the collection and preservation of the Prophet's tradition as you did in the case of the Qur'ān?"⁽¹³⁴⁾ This may be taken to indicate that until the first decades of the 3rd/9th century, views and reports such as those supported and cited by Sunniite traditionists had not yet found their way into the mainstream of Shī'ism.

(127) Sulaym, p. 108.

(128) Khayyāt, *al-Intiṣār*, ed. M. S. Nyberg (Cairo, 1925), p. 41; 'Abd al-Jabbār, *al-Mughnī*, XX (1), ed. 'A. Maḥmūd and S. Dunyā (Cairo, 1966), pp. 37-38; Malaṭī, *al-Tanbīh* (Damascus, 1949), p. 32.

(129) Sayyārī, fol. 2b.

(130) Najāshī, *Kitāb al-Rijāl*, ed. M. Shubayrī Zanjānī (Qum, 1407/1986), p. 372.

(131) See above, note 29.

(132) Sayyārī, fol. 69a: Kulaynī, II, p. 631.

(133) Al-Faḍl b. Shādhān, pp. 209-29.

(134) *Ibid.*, p. 108.

A similar indication can be concluded from al-Hārith b. Asad al-Muḥāsibī's (d. 243/857-8) attack on the Shī'ites of his time who, he said, blamed 'Uthmān for his burning of the copies and fragments of the Qur'ān other than his own codex.⁽¹³⁵⁾ According to al-Muḥāsibī, they criticized 'Uthmān on legal grounds, namely that burning the Qur'ān was an inappropriate innovation which fell short of the respect due to the records of the divine revelation.⁽¹³⁶⁾ This conforms to the long-held Shī'ite legal ruling that worn fragments of the Qur'ān that can no longer be used may be buried or washed in water, but not burnt. The thinking behind this opinion is clearly based on the connection between fire and sin, or on the reference that might be drawn from book burning to the evil and misleading nature of the contents of the book concerned. Neither in that discussion, nor in the relevant chapter of his work on the Qur'ān,⁽¹³⁷⁾ does al-Muḥāsibī make reference to Shī'ite support for the idea of omission and alteration in the text of the Qur'ān. The juxtaposition of the account of the Sufi al-Muḥāsibī on this topic and that of the theologian al-Jāḥiẓ, who accused the Shī'ites of his time of supporting this idea,⁽¹³⁸⁾ clearly suggests that, at the beginning of the 3rd/9th century, it was still a theme used by the Shī'ite *mutakallimūn* of the time, the section of the Shī'ite community with which a theologian like al-Jāḥiẓ must have been in contact, in their interdenominational debates with the Mu'tazilites as a polemical strategy, and was not a common belief among even a considerable portion of the Shī'ite community at large that al-Muḥāsibī could take note of.

*
**

The Imāms and the Shī'ite scholars of the 2nd/8th century rejected the opinion that suggested the alteration of the text of the Qur'ān. This point is clearly demonstrated by the fact that in the long list of their complaints against the first three caliphs there is

(135) Muḥāsibī, *Fahm al-sunan* (quoted in Zarkashī, I, pp. 238-40), p. 240.

(136) The reports which quote 'Alī as defending 'Uthmān's action in this case seem, therefore, to address these criticisms. According to one report 'Alī said "no one should blame 'Uthmān for the burning of the copies of the Qur'ān since he did that with the approval of all of us. If he had not done it I would have done it" (Ibn Abī Dāwūd, pp. 12, 22; Ibn 'Asākir, the biography of 'Uthmān, pp. 237, 238, 242).

(137) Idem, *Fahm al-Qur'ān*, pp. 398-411.

(138) See below, note 183.

no accusation of tampering with the text of the Qur'ān.⁽¹³⁹⁾ The complaint was rather that the caliphs and their followers “preserved the text of the Scripture but distorted its message.”⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ There was a clear attempt on the part of the Imāms to defuse problems which could arise by the above-cited Sunnite reports. In some cases, for instance, they interpreted the narratives in a way that protected the integrity of the ‘Uthmānic text. A quotation from ‘Alī, for instance, suggests that one-quarter of the Qur'ān spoke of the House of the Prophet and another quarter, of their foes.⁽¹⁴¹⁾ Neither of these two fractions applies to the ‘Uthmānic text, which could give rise to the suspicion that parts of the Qur'ān might have been omitted from that text for political reasons. A tradition from the Imāms, however, seeks to interpret ‘Alī’s statement differently. It suggests that any verse on virtues in the Qur'ān refers to the House of the Prophet, while verses on evil refer to their foes.⁽¹⁴²⁾ Other traditions from the Imāms reject the claim of earlier Sunnite reports that the names of ‘Alī or the House of the Prophet originally appeared in various verses. These traditions suggest that ‘Alī or the House of the Prophet were rather the occasion of revelation (*sabab al-nuzūl*) of those verses.⁽¹⁴³⁾

The Imāms rejected the reading of Ibn Mas‘ūd⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ which in some places departed significantly from the official text. Countless statements from the Imāms leave no doubt about their belief

(139) Kulaynī, VIII, pp. 59-62. See also Sadīd al-Dīn al-Ḥimmaṣī, I, p. 477.

(140) Kulaynī, VIII, pp. 53, 54: *aqāmū ḥurūfa 'l-kilāb wa ḥarrafū ḥudūdah*.

(141) Ya‘qūbī, II, p. 136; Bahā’ al-Dīn al-Irbilī, I, p. 314; ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥamza, *al-Shāfi* (San‘ā, 1986), II, p. 25. Cf. ‘Ayyāshī, I, pp. 9-10 and Kulaynī, II, p. 627, where one third is allocated for each category.

(142) ‘Ayyāshī, I, pp. 9-10, 13; Sharaf al-Dīn al-Astarābādī; *Ta’wīl al-āyāt al-zāhira* (Qum, 1407/1986), I, pp. 18-20; Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-anwār* (Tehran, 1376/1957-), XXIV, p. 303.

(143) See, for instance, the nine quotations from different Imāms on Qur'ān 5: 67 in Furāt al-Kūfī, *Kilāb al-Tafsīr* (Najaf, 1354/1935), pp. 36-38 which categorically deny the claim that the name of ‘Alī was originally mentioned in that verse as was reported by some Sunnite authorities (see, for example, Suyūṭī, *Durr*, II, p. 298); Also a statement from the 5th Imām, Muḥammad al-Bāqir, to the effect that the House of the Prophet is implicitly included in the Qur'ān 3:33, as that House is the true remnant of the House of Abraham, which is mentioned in that verse (‘Ayyāshī, I, p. 168; Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, XXIII, p. 225). This latter statement is against the reading of ‘Abd Allāh b. Mas‘ūd as reported by Sunnite scholars such as Abū Ishāq al-Tha‘labī al-Naysābūrī in his *al-Kashf wa 'l-tanzīl* (as quoted by ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥamza, I, p. 95).

(144) Kulaynī, II, p. 634.

in the authenticity of the text of the Qur'ān as preserved in the 'Uthmānic codex. They instructed their followers to follow the Qur'ān as the indisputable word of God⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ and the highest authority of religion,⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ and as the touchstone for testing the truthfulness of traditions.⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ Falsehood cannot come to it, they said, since it is the strong rope of God which was not made for any specific period of time, rather as a permanent proof and manual of truth for the whole of mankind.⁽¹⁴⁸⁾

The only point where the Imāms disagreed with the 'Uthmānic codex was on the way that *sūras* 93, 94, 105 and 106 were arranged in that text. The Imāms,⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ and following them the Shī'ite scholars—up to the present⁽¹⁵⁰⁾—maintained, and always openly declared, that *sūras* 105 and 106 are a single *sūra* as it appeared in the codex of Ubayy.⁽¹⁵¹⁾ Likewise, they regarded the two *sūras* 93 and 94 as two parts of a single *sūra*, a position also supported by such early Muslim authorities as 'Umar b. 'Abd al-'Azīz and the *lābi'i* Ṭāwūs b. Kaysān.⁽¹⁵²⁾

*
**

(145) See, for instance, Kulaynī, II, pp. 596-634; Ibn Bābawayh, *Kitāb al-Amālī* (Tehran, 1404/1984), pp. 545-46; Idem, *'Uyūn akhbār al-Riḍā* (Tehran, 1377-79/1958-59), II, p. 56. Also Ḥurr al-'Āmilī, *Wasā'il al-Shī'a* (Tehran, 1376-89/1957-69), IV, pp. 823-31; Ḥusayn al-Nūrī, *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* (Qum, 1407/1987), IV, pp. 231-45.

(146) See al-Sharīf al-Raḍī, *Nahj al-Balāgha*, sermons 1, 18, 108, 145, 156, 174, 181, 196 and letter 69.

(147) Kulaynī, I, pp. 69-70, 100; Ibn Bābawayh, *'Uyūn*, II, p. 21; Idem, *Amālī*, p. 367; Ḥurr al-'Āmilī, XVIII, pp. 78-89; Ḥusayn al-Nūrī, *Mustadrak*, XVII, pp. 302-6.

(148) Ibn Bābawayh, *'Uyūn*, II, p. 130.

(149) Sayyārī, fol. 70b; Shalmaghānī, *Kitāb al-Taklīf* (published as *al-Fiqh al-mansūb ila 'l-Imām al-Riḍā* [Mashhad, 1406/1986]), pp. 112-13; Ibn Bābawayh, *Thawāb al-a'māl*, ed. 'A. A. Ghaffārī (Tehran, 1391/1971), p. 154; Idem, *Man lā Yaḥḍuruh al-faqīh*, ed. 'A. A. Ghaffārī (Tehran, 1392-94/1972-74), I, p. 306; Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Tūsī, *al-Tibyān* (Najaf, 1957-63), X, pp. 371, 412; Idem, *al-Istibṣār*, ed. Ḥ. M. Kharsān (Najaf, 1375-76/1955-57), I, p. 317; Ṭabrisī, *Majma' al-Bayān* (Sidon, 1956-57), XXX, pp. 140-41, 197; *Ilqān*, I, p. 228; Ḥurr al-'Āmilī, IV, pp. 743-44; Ḥusayn al-Nūrī, IV, pp. 163-64.

(150) See Jawād al-'Āmilī, *Miftāḥ al-Karāma* (Cairo-Sidon-Tehran, 1324/1906-), II, pp. 385-86 and the sources mentioned therein.

(151) *Ilqān*, I, p. 228; Jeffery, p. 179.

(152) Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, *al-Tafsīr al-kabīr* (Cairo, 1962), XXXII, p. 2; *Ilqān*, I, p. 228.

Over time, however, many Sunnite readings, narratives, and opinions penetrated Shī'ite *ḥadīth* and were mistakenly attributed to the Imāms. Many of these Shī'ite narratives are simply exact copies of material already found in Sunnite oral culture and books. From Ibn Mas'ūd's reading adding the House of the Prophet to those of Abraham and 'Imrān in 3:33⁽¹⁵³⁾ and the mention of the House of the Prophet in other cases,⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ to the insertion of the name of 'Alī in some verses,⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ to the claim that the Qur'ānic verses in the original text were greater in number than those in the present Qur'ān,⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ to the assertion that the original text included the stoning verse⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ and the verse on the "two gold fields"⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ as part of *sūra* 33,⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ to the point that *sūras* 33 (*al-Aḥzāb*)⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ and 98 (*al-Bayyina*)⁽¹⁶¹⁾ were originally much longer than they are now—all of these opinions had been circulating in Sunnite circles for almost two centuries. The only difference was that they were now found in Shī'ite works and ascribed to Shī'ite authorities with, and sometimes without,⁽¹⁶²⁾ pseudo-Shī'ite chains of authority.

Another factor clearly contributed to the introduction of this genre of material into Shī'ite literature: the special interest of the followers of some extremist heretic movements among the Shī'ite sects.⁽¹⁶³⁾ They exploited such reports in their interdenominatio-

(153) Sayyārī, fol. 12; 'Ayyāshī, I, pp. 169, 170; 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm, *Tafsīr al-Qummī* = *Kitāb al-Tafsīr* (Najaf, 1386/1966), I, p. 100; Furāt al-Kūfī, p. 18; Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī, XXIII, pp. 222, 225-28.

(154) Sayyārī, fol. 7b, 9b, 16b, 17, 24b, 33b, 39b, 51b.

(155) Sayyārī, fols. 7b, 10a, 16b, 17a, 18a, 45a, 62b; 'Ayyāshī, I, p. 245; Kulaynī, I, pp. 344, 345, 461. Compare, for instance, Sayyārī's claim (fol. 45) that 33:25 originally read *kafa 'llāhu 'l-mu'minīna 'l-qitāla bi 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib* with Suyūṭī, *Durr*, V, p. 192 (also Baha' al-Dīn al-Irbilī, I, p. 317, quoting from Sunnite sources), where this is quoted as the reading of Ibn Mas'ūd.

(156) Sayyārī, fol. 2b; Kulaynī, II, p. 634. This was originally claimed by 'Umar as quoted in *Ilqān*, I, p. 242; Muttaqī, *Kanz al-'ummāl* (Aleppo, 1969-77), I, pp. 517, 541.

(157) Sayyārī, fol. 44b.

(158) *Ibid.*, fol. 45b.

(159) *Ibid.*, fol. 44b.

(160) *Ibid.*, fols. 44a-b; Ibn Bābawayh, *Thawāb al-a'māl* p. 100.

(161) Sayyārī, fol. 69a; Kulaynī, II, p. 631; Kashshī, p. 589.

(162) See Sayyārī, *passim*, where Sunnite materials are cited as parts of statements of the Shī'ite scholars, not as Shī'ite *ḥadīths* which should normally go back to the Imāms (e.g., fol. 2b from Hishām b. Sālim); also where those materials are quoted under general references such as *fī ḥadīth* (e.g., fol. 45b) and *ruwiya* (e.g., fol. 44a), which indicate that there existed no Shī'ite source or chain of authority for them.

(163) See Bāqillānī, p. 310.

nal debates with their moderate Shī'ite contemporaries. Many of the Sunnite narratives on the corruption of the text of the Qur'ān were introduced into Shī'ite literature by, and under the authority of, *ḥadīth* transmitters like Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Sayyārī,⁽¹⁶⁴⁾ who is the ultimate authority for more than one-third of all the material on this subject in Shī'ite works,⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ and Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan b. Jumhūr al-'Ammī al-Baṣrī⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ (both from mid-3rd/9th century) and al-Mufaḍḍal b. 'Umar al-Ju'fī,⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ Yūnus b. Zabyān,⁽¹⁶⁸⁾ and Munakhkhal b. Jamīl al-Kūfī⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ (all from the late 2nd/8th century). All of these individuals were known for their extremist, heretical tendencies, and because of these tendencies were excluded from the mainstream of Shī'ism in their own times as well as later.

Due mainly to the persistent efforts of the extremist groups within the Shī'ite community, the bulk of material on this subject grew dramatically during the first half of the 3rd/9th century. Building on the foundation established by the Sunnite authorities and following the pattern of this Sunnite material, they expended much effort on other, similar cases where the name of 'Alī or a reference to the House of the Prophet could be inserted in a verse in order to make the claim that one or the other had been deliberately omitted. A comprehensive presentation of the results of these efforts is available in al-Sayyārī's *Kilāb al-Qira'āt* (also known as *Kilāb al-Tanzīl wa 'l-taḥrīf*).

*
**

Beginning in the middle of the 3rd/9th century, many Shī'ite traditionists tended to believe in the authenticity of these

(164) *Ḍa'if, mutahāfiṭ, ghāl, munḥarīf* (Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, *kitāb al-Ḍu'afā'*, in Quḥ-pā'i, *Majma' al-rijāl*, ed. D. 'Allāma [Iṣfahān, 1384-87/1964-67], I, p. 149).

(165) Rasūl Ja'fariyān, *Ukdhubāt taḥrīf al-Qur'ān bayn al-Shī'a wa 'l-Sunna* (Tehran, 1985), p. 46.

(166) *Ghāl* (Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, *Kilāb al-Rijāl*, ed. M. Ṣ. Āl Bahr al-'Ulūm [Najaf, 1961], p. 387); *ghāl fāsid al-ḥadīth, lā yuktabu ḥadīthuhu* (Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, V, p. 184); *fāsid al-madhhab wa qīla fīhi ashya' Allāh a'lam bihā min 'izāmihā* (Najāshī, p. 337).

(167) *Ḍa'if, mutahāfiṭ, murtafi' al-qawl, Khaṭṭābī... ḥamala 'l-Ghulātu fī ḥadīthihi ḥamlan 'azīman, lā yajūzu an yuktaba ḥadīthuhu* (Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, VI, p. 131); *fāsid al-madhhab, mudṭarib al-riwāya, lā yu'ba'u bihi* (Najāshī, p. 416).

(168) *Muttaḥam ghāl* (Kashshī, p. 363); *Kadhkhāb mashhūr* (Kashshī, p. 546); *ghāl waddā' li 'l-ḥadīth* (Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, VI, p. 292).

(169) *Lā shay', muttaḥam bi 'l-ghuluww* (Kashshī, p. 368); *ḍa'if, fī madhhabihī ghuluww* (Ibn al-Ghaḍā'irī, VI, p. 139).

reports. Like their Sunni counterparts, they maintained that the text of the Qur'ān suffered from omissions and alterations. Traditionists such as 'Alī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (d. ca. 307/919-20) and Sa'd b. 'Abd Allāh al-Ash'arī (d. 299-301/912-14) are clearly in this camp. Others quoted reports on the topic without comment but may have believed in their authenticity. These included Muḥammad b. Mas'ūd al-'Ayyāshī (late 3rd/9th century), Muḥammad b. Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī (d. 329/941), Muḥammad b. 'Umar al-Kashshī (early 4th/10th century), and Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm al-Nu'mānī (d. ca. 350/961).⁽¹⁷⁰⁾ There was, however, no unanimity on the matter among the Shī'ite traditionists. For example, scholars such as Ibn Bābawayh (d. 381/991-2), who was a representative of the more learned branch of the traditionist school⁽¹⁷¹⁾ and whose opinion normally represents the viewpoint of all scholars of that branch, strongly rejected the idea. His position also sheds light on the dominant opinion among his mainstream Shī'ite contemporaries. His statement reads as follows:

Our belief is that the Qur'ān which God revealed to His Prophet Muḥammad is [identical with] the one between the two boards, and that it is that which is in the hands of the people, and it is not greater in extent than it... He who asserts that we say that it is greater in extent than this [present text] is a liar.⁽¹⁷²⁾

References to this difference of opinion among the Shī'ite scholars of that period also appear in a contemporary Sunni heresiographical work, the *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* of Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī (d. 324/936). It names two⁽¹⁷³⁾ Shī'ite groups of his time:

(170) See Etan Kohlberg, "Some notes on the Imamite Attitude to the Qur'ān," in S. M. Stern *et al.* (eds.), *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition* (Oxford, 1972), pp. 211 ff.

(171) See my *Introduction to Shī'ī Law* (London, 1984), pp. 32-33.

(172) Ibn Bābawayh, *Risāla fi 'l-i'tiqādāt* (Tehran, 1370/1951, together with Miqdād al-Suyūrī's *al-Nāfi' yaum al-ḥashr fī sharḥ al-bāb al-ḥādī'ashr*, pp. 66-115), p. 93. See also the title of a work by another Shī'ite traditionist of the same period, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. al-Junayd al-Iskāfī, mentioned by Najāshī, p. 388, as: *Idāh khaṭa' man shanna 'a 'ala 'l-Shī'a fī amr al-Qur'ān*.

(173) The text here reads "three groups" although nothing is said about the third group. In H. Ritter's edition of this work (Istanbul, 1929) a footnote describes that missing group, on the basis of a marginal note in one manuscript, as "those who maintain that non-Qur'ānic materials have been added to the text." This is, however, undoubtedly false, as there apparently never existed a group who claimed additions to the text of the Qur'an but not omissions. It is, therefore, appropriate to think that either the number is an error, or that the author intended to say that a third group believed that materials had been both added to and omitted from the

one believes parts of the original Qur'ān to be missing, although nothing could have been added or altered in the text; and the other denies any change at all.⁽¹⁷⁴⁾

Commenting on the disagreement among the Shi'ites on this question, al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (d. 436-1044) identifies those Shi'ites who supported the view of their Sunnite counterparts in this case as “only a group of traditionists who do not understand what they are saying nor know where they are going, those who always follow narratives and submit to whatever is quoted, whether true or false, without any thought or reflection, whose views are not worth attention.”⁽¹⁷⁵⁾ He continues: “As for the scholars, theologians, and rational debaters of our school such as Abū Ja'far ibn Qiba, Abu'l-Aḥwaṣ, the Nawbakhtīs,⁽¹⁷⁶⁾ and their predecessors and successors, we have never come across any opinion among them concerning alleged omissions in the text of the Qur'ān.”⁽¹⁷⁷⁾ The view of the traditionists soon started to wane in the face of the attacks of Shi'ite scholars of the 4th/10th century, and it totally

Qur'ān; so one group claims change in the form of omissions, another claims change in the form of both omissions and additions, and a third one denies change of any kind.

(174) Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī, *Maqālāt*, I, pp. 114-15.

(175) Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, *Jawābāt al-masā'il al-Ṭarābulusiyyāt al-ūlā* (quoted in Tabrisī, *Majma' al-bayān*, I, p. 31); Idem, *al-Dhakhīra fi 'l-kalām* (microfilm 3344, Central Library, Tehran University), p. 256.

(176) There is a confusion about the Nawbakhtīs' position in this dispute. A statement in al-Shaykh al-Mufīd's *Awā'il al-maqālāt*, p. 56, suggests that they thought the text of the Qur'ān had been subject to “additions and omissions.” This is, however, highly doubtful since (a) al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, as is shown above, explicitly dismisses the idea that the Nawbakhtīs held such an opinion, (b) he also states in both his *al-Ṭarābulusiyyāt al-ūlā* and his *al-Dhakhīra* that nobody among the Shi'ites ever maintained the idea of additions in the text of the Qur'ān (Tabrisī, I, p. 30, also stated by al-Murtaḍā's pupil, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Tūsī in his *al-Tibyān*, I, p. 3), a statement that could hardly be made if such well-known scholars as the Nawbakhtīs had supported that opinion, and (c) the Mu'tazilite Qādī 'Abd al-Jabbār in the section on imamate of his book, *al-Mughnī* (XX (1), p. 38) categorically denies that the Nawbakhtīs supported ideas such as the possibility that changes had taken place in the text of the Qur'ān, an idea that he had previously attributed to Hishām b. al-Ḥakam and others (*fa-man kāna yata-massaku bi 'l-tawhīdi wa 'l-'adli fa-huwa barī'un mimma nasabnāhu ilā man taqad-dama dhikruhu, ka-Abi 'l-Aḥwaṣ wa 'l-Nawbakhtīyya wa ghayrihim*). The tone of the statement in *Awā'il al-maqālāt* is also unusually hesitant, as it says: *wa hādha bi-khilāf mā samī'nāhu min* [read 'an] *banī Nawbakht...* The emphasis on “rumor” appears nowhere else in that work in connection with the Nawbakhtīs.

(177) Asad Allāh al-Tustarī, *Kashf al-qinā'* (Tehran, 1317/1899), p. 205, quoting al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā's statement in one of his collections of answers (*jawābāt al-masā'il*).

disappeared from the scene in the first decades of the following century⁽¹⁷⁸⁾ following the defeat of the traditionist school of Shī'ite thought.

It is likely that extremist sects continued to hold that belief in the following centuries, although no hard evidence can be offered in support of this assumption. The publications of some of the present-day pro-extremist Shī'ites in India and Pakistan suggest that their authors tend to believe that parts of the revelation are missing from the present Qur'ān.⁽¹⁷⁹⁾ From the end of the 4th/10th century up to the present, a total of seven Shī'ite scholars⁽¹⁸⁰⁾ are known to have supported the idea that there are omissions in the 'Uthmānic text, mainly on the basis of the Sunnite material on the subject.⁽¹⁸¹⁾ To a great extent they are also heirs

(178) See al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, *al-Taṭābulusiyyāt al-ūlā*, quoted by Ṭabrisī, I, p. 30, where the supporters of this opinion among the Shī'ites are referred to in the past tense.

(179) See Ja'fariyān, p. 66.

(180) They are Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ b. Aḥmad al-Māzandarānī (d. 1086/1676) in his *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi* (Tehran, 1382-88/1963-68), XI, pp. 71-72; Ni'mat Allāh b. 'Abd Allāh al-Jazā'ir (d. 1112/1810) in his *al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyya*, ed. M. 'A. Qāḍī Ṭabāṭabā'i (Tabriz, 1382/1963), I, pp. 97, 277, II, pp. 357-8; Abu 'l-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad Ṭāhir al-Sharīf al-'Āmilī (d. 1138/1725-26) in his *Ḍiyā' al-'ālamīn fi 'l-imāma*, as quoted by Ḥusayn al-Nūrī in *Faṣl al-khiṭāb* (Tehran, 1298/1881), p. 97; 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad Ridā al-Ḥusaynī Shubbar (d. 1242/1826) in his *Maṣābiḥ al-anwār* (Baghdad and Najaf, 1951-52), II, p. 295; Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Mahdī al-Narāqī (d. 1245/1829) in his *Manāḥij al-aḥkām*, p. 153, l. 1, also quoting it from his father, Muḥammad Mahdī b. Abī Dharr al-Narāqī (d. 1209/1794-95) (*ibid.*, p. 152, ll. 3-4); and Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad Taqī al-Nūrī (d. 1320/1902), who is the best known supporter of this opinion among Shī'ites, in his monograph on the subject, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*. In the same work al-Nūrī attributes this opinion to 'Alī b. Aḥmad al-Ḥusaynī al-Madanī, known as Ibn Ma'ṣūm and Sayyid 'Alī Khān (d. 1120/1709) in his *Riyāḍ al-sālikin*; but this scholar only quotes various opinions and some of the Sunnite material on the subject, and adopts no specific position himself. See his above-mentioned work (Tehran, 1334/1915), p. 402.

(181) See especially Ḥusayn al-Nūrī, *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, pp. 35-328, in which he argues in support of the above-mentioned opinion with twelve different categories of narratives as follows: (1) Sunnite narratives that state that whatever happened in previous religions will be repeated in Islam (pp. 35-73); (2) Sunnite narratives on the collection of the Qur'ān (pp. 73-82); (3) Sunnite narratives on *naskh al-tilāwa* (pp. 82-97); (4) Sunnite narratives on the different arrangement of the collection of 'Alī (pp. 97-110); (5) sunnite narratives on the differences between the collection of 'Abd Allāh b. Mas'ūd and the 'Uthmānic codex (pp. 112-21); (6) Sunnite narratives on the length of the collection of Ubayy (pp. 121-26); (7) Sunnite narratives on 'Uthmān's burning of the other collections (pp. 126-48); (8) Sunnite narratives on omissions and missing items in the present Qur'ān (pp. 148-60); (9) Shī'ite narratives that suggest that 'Alī and the House of the Prophet were explicitly mentioned

of the traditionist school, and their scholarship reflects similar tendencies.⁽¹⁸²⁾ Otherwise, the idea remained a marginal one in Shī'ite literature, supported only by some traditionists of the 3rd and 4th/9th and 10th centuries.

*
**

Despite these facts, opponents of Shī'ism have accused all Shī'ites throughout history of believing that the text of the Qur'ān is corrupt.

The earliest allegation of this kind appears in the works of the Mu'tazilite al-Jāhīz (d. 255/869), who accused all contemporary Shī'ites of holding such an attitude.⁽¹⁸³⁾ He was followed by another Mu'tazilite, al-Khayyāt (late 3rd/9th century), who in his *Kitāb al-Intiṣār* also attributes this view to all Shī'ites.⁽¹⁸⁴⁾ It is, however, the style of these two authors to ascribe to the entire Shī'ite community opinions held only by some Shī'ite individuals, including cases where only a single Shī'ite polemicist, such as His-

in the Books of God (pp. 160-86); (10) Sunnite narratives on different readings (pp. 186-211); (11) Shī'ite narrative on omissions in the present Qur'ān (pp. 211-27) and (12) Shī'ite narratives on the alleged correct form of some specific verses (pp. 227-328). (There are also a few Shī'ite quotations in some of the earlier chapters.) As is very clear from this summary, the argument is overwhelmingly dependent on the Sunnite production in this field. (*Ja'fariyān*, pp. 67-71. See also Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Māzandarānī, XI, p. 72; Ibn Ma'sūm, *Riyāḍ al-sāliḥīn*, p. 402.)

(182) See Kohlberg, «Some notes...», pp. 217-18.

(183) Jāhīz, *Hujaj al-nubuwwa* (in the collection *Rasā'il al-Jāhīz*, ed. 'A. M. Hārūn [Cairo, 1979], III, pp. 221-81), p. 223.

(184) Khayyāt, pp. 6, 41, 107, 159, 164. It should be noted that the expressions *radd al-Qur'ān* or *mukhālafat al-naṣṣ* which also appear in this book in arguments against some Shī'ite viewpoints have nothing to do with the question of omission and alteration of the text of the Qur'ān. Rather, these expressions refer to the Shī'ite rejection of the Sunnite interpretations of such verses as 9:40, 100 and 48:18 which deal with the qualities of the companions of the Prophet and the like. A somewhat similar case is a statement in Ibn 'Abd Rabbih's *al-'Iqd al-farīd*, II, p. 410, that *al-Rāfiḍa ḥarrafat al-Qur'ān*. This refers to the way that the Shī'ites used to interpret some Qur'ānic verses in support of their doctrines, which were, in some cases, interpretations of verses taken out of context, at least from a Sunnite point of view. The quotation from al-Sha'bī at the bottom of the same page of this latter work about the *ta'wīl al-Rawāfiḍ fī 'l-Qur'ān* confirms this. The same must be said about al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīyya's assertion that the Saba'iyya *ḥarrafū kitāb Allāh* (see his *Kitāb al-Irjā'*, ed. J. Van Ess [in *Arabica*, 21 (1974), pp. 20-25], p. 24). The idea he ascribed to them to the effect that the Prophet "withheld nine tenths of the Qur'ān" has clearly nothing to do with our topic.

hām b. al-Hakam, held a deviant opinion. This is especially true for al-Khayyāt's book. It is a fierce, harshly worded sectarian polemic, a fact that dictates the need for some caution in approaching its pro-Mu'tazilite and anti-Shī'ite material.

By the time of al-Khayyāt, however, this idea had already penetrated into Shī'ite literature and had gone beyond an *argumentum ad hominem*. A third Mu'tazilite theologian of this century, Abū 'Alī al-Jubbā'ī (d. 303/916) also ascribed the view to all Shī'ites, indiscriminately.⁽¹⁸⁵⁾ Abu 'l-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī's statement regarding the existence of two groups among the Shī'ites of his time on this question (cited above) is more accurate than the accounts of the three Mu'tazilites. His follower al-Bāqillānī (d. 403/1013) also speaks of the extremists among the Shī'a who have fabricated reports which suggested that 'Alī disagreed with other Companions over the Qur'ān, and of the overwhelming majority of the Shī'ites who rejected those reports.⁽¹⁸⁶⁾ Elsewhere, however, al-Bāqillānī ascribes arguments against the integrity of the 'Uthmānic text to "the Shī'ites" in general;⁽¹⁸⁷⁾ though also makes a reference to their disagreement about the nature of the alterations.⁽¹⁸⁸⁾ The Mu'tazilite Qādī 'Abd al-Jabbār (d. 415/1025) mentions the "claim of the Shī'ites that the first generation of the Muslims changed the texts and the Qur'ān."⁽¹⁸⁹⁾ In another work, however, he attributed that claim to *many* of the debaters of the traditionalist school of Shī'ite theology, and excluded the followers of the rationalist tendency among the Shī'ites from that accusation.⁽¹⁹⁰⁾ Later Mu'tazilites,⁽¹⁹¹⁾ as well as some Ash'arites,⁽¹⁹²⁾ echoed such statements without further explanation.

Some decades later, the Zāhirite Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456/1054) accuses all Imāmites, past and present, of believing in the corruption of the text of the Qur'ān through additions, omissions, and altera-

(185) Ibn Tāwūs, *Sa'd al-su'ūd* (Najaf, 1950), p. 144, quoting Jubba'ī in his *Tafsīr al-Qur'ān*.

(186) Bāqillānī, p. 310.

(187) *Ibid.*, pp. 258 ff.

(188) *Ibid.*, p. 603.

(189) 'Abd al-Jabbār, *Tathbūt dalā'il al-nubuwwa*, ed. 'A. 'Uthmān (Beirut, 1966), p. 131.

(190) Idem, *Mughnī*, XX (1), p. 38.

(191) See, for instance, al-Ḥākim al-Jishumī, *Risālat Iblīs ilā ikhwānih al-manāḥis*, ed. Ḥ. Modarressi (Qum, 1985), p. 135.

(192) See, for instance, 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī, p. 274. Also Zarkashī, II, p. 127 quoting Bāqillānī in his *Kitāb al-Intiṣār*.

tions. The only exceptions, he said, were al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā and two of his disciples who rejected that view and excommunicated whoever supported it.⁽¹⁹³⁾ If this accusation was true, one wonders how al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (as well as Ibn Bābawayh half a century before him and al-Ṭūsī half a century after him) could so strongly assert that “only a group of Shī‘ite traditionists” supported the idea of the corruption of the text of the Qur’ān. Abu ‘l-Muẓaffar al-Isfarā‘īnī (d. 471/1078-79) goes still further and states that “the Imāmites unanimously agree that the Qur’ān was altered, through additions and deletions by the Companions.”⁽¹⁹⁴⁾ Most later Sunnite polemics against the Shī‘ites—up to the present⁽¹⁹⁵⁾—repeat the same allegation, usually without acknowledging any exceptions. Many modern students of Islam, including Ignaz Goldziher,⁽¹⁹⁶⁾ trusted these accounts and made similar remarks.

More interesting, later Sunnites even accuse the Shī‘ites of *initiating* this idea against the consensus of all other Muslims, namely, the Sunnites. Authors like al-Zamakhsharī and the anonymous writer of *Ba‘d faḍā’ih al-Rawāfiḍ* attributed to the Shī‘ites the story of the domestic animal who entered the house of ‘Ā’isha and gobbled up a sheet on which two verses of the Qur’ān were recorded, even though the story is reported exclusively⁽¹⁹⁷⁾ by the Sunnites through what they describe as “reliable chains of authority,”⁽¹⁹⁸⁾ and is quoted in many of their authentic sources. Nevertheless, such authors describe it as a “fabrication of the Rāfiḍites [the Imāmite Shī‘ites]!”⁽¹⁹⁹⁾ Muḥammad ‘Abd

(193) Ibn Ḥazm, *al-Fiṣal fi ‘l-milal wa ‘l-ahwā’ wa ‘l-niḥal* (Riyadh, 1982), V, p. 40.

(194) Isfarā‘īnī, p. 41.

(195) Some most recent examples are Rashīd Riḍā, *al-Sunna wa ‘l-Shi‘a* (Cairo, 1347/1928), pp. 43, 55, 65; Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, *al-Khuṭū‘ al-‘arīḍa* (Jiddah, 1380/1961), pp. 8-14; Qaṣīmī, *al-Shirā’ bayn al-Islām wa ‘l-wathāniyya* (Cairo, 1956/57), I, p. 374; Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāḥib, *al-Shi‘a wa ‘l-Sunna* (Riyadh, n.d.), pp. 77-152; Idem, *al-Shi‘a wa ‘l-Qur’ān* (Lahore, 1983), *passim*; Abu ‘l-Ḥasan al-Nadawī, *Ṣūratān mutaḍāddatān*, pp. 79-80.

(196) See his *Die Richtungen der Islamischen Koranauslegung* (Leiden, 1952), pp. 270-76.

(197) See ‘Abd al-Jalīl al-Qazwīnī, p. 135. The story has only been quoted from the Sunnites in Sulaym, p. 108 (also quoted in Abū Maṣṣūr al-Ṭabrisī, I, p. 222) and al-Faḍl b. Shādhān, pp. 211-12, in anti-Sunnite arguments.

(198) See Zamakhsharī, III, p. 518, footnote.

(199) Zamakhsharī, III, p. 518: *wa ammā mā yuḥkā anna tilka ‘l-ziyāda* [= the stoning verse] *kānat fī ṣaḥīfa fī bayt ‘Ā’isha-radiya ‘llāhu ‘anhā-fa akalatha ‘l-dājīn fa min ta ‘l-ifāt al-malāhida wa ‘l-Rawāfiḍ*; ‘Abd al-Jalīl al-Qazwīnī, p. 133, quoting

al-'Azīm al-Zurqānī blames the extremist Shī'ites for claiming that the Qur'ānic verses in the original text were greater in number than those in the present Qur'ān, that *sūra* 33 (*al-Aḥzāb*) was longer than it is now, and that 33:25 originally read *kafa 'llāhu'l-mu'minīna 'l-qitāla bi 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib*.⁽²⁰⁰⁾ As noted above, all of these claims were perfectly Sunnite.⁽²⁰¹⁾

Hossein MODARRESSI
(Princeton, N.J., U.S.A.)

the Sunnite author of *Ba'd faḍā'iḥ al-Rawāfiḍ* as saying: *wa qūand [i.e., the Shī'a] keh basī az Qur'ān boz-e 'A'isha bekhord*.

(200) Zurqānī, *Manāhil al-'irfān*, 3rd ed. (Cairo, n.d.), I, p. 280.

(201) See above, notes 156 (on the number of the Qur'ānic verses in the original text), 30-33 (on the original length of *sūrat al-Aḥzāb*), and 155 (on the Qur'ān 33:25).